DRAFT

College Council

September 20, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

AGENDA

1. Review and Approval of Minutes – May 17, 2012

2. Review Charge of the Committee

3. Old Business
   a. Mapped Accreditation Standards — J. Noble
   b. Accreditation Mid-Term Report — J. Noble
   c. Student Learning Outcomes Implementation Report — J. Noble
   d. Improvement Plan Document — J. Noble
   e. Program Review - Review and Status of Summer Projects — E. Cole/ Designee
   f. Timeline for Mission/Values/Vision, Goals, Strategic Planning — J. Noble

4. New Business
   a. Report from Academic Services – Division Realignment? — J. Noble
   b. Consideration of College Committees' Structure and Charge — K. Walthers
   c. Planning Task Force, Fall 2012 — K. Walthers/S. Thompson

5. Informational Items
   a. VP of Administrative Services Recruiting Update — K. Walthers
   b. Academic Senate Flex Day Report ? — M. Sato

6. Coordination of Information
   a. Academic Services
   b. Administrative Services
   c. Student Services
   d. College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)
   e. Facilities Committee
   f. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
   g. Planning & Budget Committee (PBC)
   h. Staff Development Committee
   i. Sustainability Committee
   j. Academic Senate
   k. Classified Senate
   l. Student Senate
   m. Faculty Association
   n. SEIU

LAS POSITAS
COLLEGE

College Council

September 20, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

7. Next Steps

8. 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?

9. Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting: October 25, 2012
Room 4129
2:30 p.m.

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
STANDARD I: Institutional Mission & Effectiveness The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.	College Council Instituitonal Effectiveness	D R A F T - SEPT 2
IA: Mission The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.	College Council	
IA1 The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.	all committees	
IA2 The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.	College Council	
IA3 Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.	College Council	
IA4 The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.	College Council	

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IB1 The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.	all committees	
IB2 The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.	College Council	
IB3 The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IB4 The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.	Institutional Effectiveness	

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IB5 The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IB6 The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.	Institutional Effectiveness	
STANDARD II: Student Learning Programs & Services The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that suports learning, enhances student uncerstanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic,and personal development for all of its students.	Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes	
IIA: Instructional Programs The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.	Curriculum Distance Education Instructional Program Review Student Learning Outcomes	

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIA1 The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.	Curriculum Distance Education Instructional Program Review Student Learning Outcomes	
IIA1a The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies	Instructional Program Reivew Student Learning Outcomes	
IIA1b The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future	Curriculum Distance Education	
IIA1c The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.	Student Learning Outcomes	
IIA2 The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.	Basic Skills Curriculum Distance Education Instructional Program Review	
IIA2a The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.	Curriculum Instrcutional Program Review	
IIA2b The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general	Institutional Effectiveness Student Learning Outcomes	Advisory Committees
IIA2c High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.	Curriculum	

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIA2d The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.	Curriculum	
IIA2e The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.	Instructional Program Review	
IIA2f The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.	Institutional Effectiveness Instructional Program Review Student Learning Outcomes	
IIA2g If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.		English Department (?)
IIA2h The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.	Curriculum	
IIA2i The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.		Admissions & Records
IIA3 The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalogue. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.	Curriculum	

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIA3a An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.	Curriculum	
IIA3b A capability to be a productive individual and life long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.	Curriculum	
IIA3c A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.	Curriculum	
IIA4 All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.	Curriculum	
IIA5 Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.	Curriculum	
IIA6 The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies.4 The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline.		Office of Academic Services

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIA6a The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.		Admissions & Records and Counseling
IIA6b When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.		Office of Academic Services
IIA6c The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.		Offices of Academic Services Office of Student Services President's Office
IIA7 In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.		Board of Trustees
		Academic Senate
IIA7a Faculty distinguishes between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.		Academic Senate
IIA7b The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty.		Academic Senate

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIA7c Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.		Offices of Academic Services Office of Student Services President's Office
IIA8 Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with standards and applicable Commission policies.		
IIB: Student Support Services The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.		Office of Student Services
IIB1 The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.		Office of Student Services
IIB2 The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:		Office of Academic Services (primary) Office of Student Services (secondary)
IIB2a General Information - Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Web Site Address of the Institution: Educational Mission; Course, Program, and Degree Offerings; Academic Calendar and Program Length; Academic Freedom Statement; Available Student Financial Aid; Available Learning Resources; Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty; Names of		Offices of Academic Services
		Office of Student Services

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
Governing Board Members.		President's Office
IIB2b Requirements: Admissions; Student Fees and Other Financial Obligations; Degree, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer.		Office of Student Services -- Admissions & Records
IIB2c Major Policies Affecting Students: Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty; Nondiscrimination; Acceptance of Transfer Credits; Grievance and Complaint Procedures; Sexual Harassment; Refund of Fees.		Office of Student Services
IIB2d Locations or Publications Where Other Policies May be Found.		Office of Academic Services
IIB3 The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.		Office of Student Services
IIB3a The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.		Office of Student Services
IIB3b The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all		Office of Student Services Campus Change Network
IIB3c The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.		Office of Student Services
IIB3d The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.		Office of Student Services Campus Change Network

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIB3e The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.		Office of Student Services -- Admissions & Records Office of Student Services -- Assessment
IIB3f The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.		Office of Student Services -- Admissions & Records
IIB4 The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.	Institutional Effectiveness	Office of Student Services
IIC: Library & Learning Support Services Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution's instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.		Office of Academic Services -- Computer Lab, Library, Teaching and Learning Center Office of Student Services -- Tutorial LPC IT

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIC1 The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.		Office of Academic Services -- ILC, Library, Teaching and Learning Center Office of Student Services
IIC1a Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.	Planning & Budget	
IIC1b The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.		Library
IIC1c The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.		Library Campus Safety
IIC1d When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.		Library

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIC2 The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.	Institutional Effectiveness	Library
STANDARD III: Resources The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieved its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IIIA: Human Resources The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness.[1] Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided	Institutional Effectiveness[4]	Administrative Team[2] Human Resources[1 2] Campus Change Network[3]
IIIA1 The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution		Human Resources Administrative Team

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIIA1a The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.		Human Resources Administrative Team
IIIA1b Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.		
IIIA1c The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.		Administrative Team Classified Senate Faculty Association
IIIA2 The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes.	CEMC	Administrative Team
IIIA3 The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.		Human Resources
IIIA3a The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.		Human Resources
IIIA3b The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.		Human Resources
IIIA4 The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.		Human Resources Campus Change Network

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIIA4a The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.		Human Resources Campus Change Network
IIIA4b The institution regularly assesses that its record in employment equity and diversity is consistent with its mission.		Human Resources Campus Change Network
IIIA4c The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.		Human Resources Campus Change Network
IIIA5 The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.	Staff Development	Human Resources Teaching and Learning Center
IIIA5a The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.	Staff Development	Human Resources Teaching and Learning
IIIA5b With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these	Staff Development	Human Resources Teaching and Learning
IIIA6 Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IIIB: Physical Resources Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.	Facilities	Office of Administrative Services
IIIB1 The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.	Facilities	Facilities Planning & Management M&O
IIIB1a The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.	Facilities	Facilities Planning & Management M&O
IIIB1b The institution assures that physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.	Facilities	Facilities Planning & Management M&O

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIIB2 To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.	Facilities	Facilities Planning & Management
IIIB2a Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.	Facilities	Facilities Planning & Management
IIIB2b Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IIIC: Technology Resources Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.	Technology Institutional Effectiveness	
IIIC1 The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and	Technology Institutional Effectiveness	
IIIC1a Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.	Technology Institutional Effectiveness	
IIIC1b The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.		Teaching & Learning Center District ITS
IIIC1c The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.	Technology	LPC IT
IIIC1d The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.	Technology	LPC IT

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIID: Financial Resources Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services.[1] The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.[2]	CEMC[1] Planning & Budget[1]	Office of Administrative Services
IIID1 The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.	College Council Planning & Budget	
IIID1a Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IIID1b Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.	College Council	Office of Administrative Services
IIID1c When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.	College Council	Administrative Team Office of Administrative Services
IIID1d The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.	College Council	Office of Administrative Services
IIID2 To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.		District Business Services Office of Administrative Services

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IIID2a Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.		District Business Services Office of Administrative Services
IIID2b Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.		District Business Services Office of Administrative Services
IIID2c The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.		District Business Services Office of Administrative Services
IIID2d The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual		District Business Services Office of Administrative
IIID2e All financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission	College Council	District Business Services Office of Administrative
IIID2f Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.	College Council	Office of Administrative Services
IIID2g The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.	Institutional Effectiveness	
IIID3 The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.	Institutional Effectiveness	

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
STANDARD IV: Leadership & Governance The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.	College Council	
IVA: Decision-Making Roles & Processes The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.	College Council	
IVA1 Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.	College Council	Administrative Team
IVA2 The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.	College Council	
IVA2a Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.	College Council	

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IVA2b The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.	College Council	
IVA3 Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies.	College Council	
IVA4 The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study, and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.	College Council	ALO
IVA5 The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.	College Council & IEC	
IVB: Board & Administrative Organization In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.		Board of Trustees District Office
IVB1 The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing		Board of Trustees District Office
IVB1a The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.		Board of Trustees

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IVB1b The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.		Board of Trustees
IVB1c The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.		Board of Trustees
IVB1d The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.		Board of Trustees
IVB1e The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.		Board of Trustees
IVB1f The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.		Board of Trustees
IVB1g The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.		Board of Trustees
IVB1h The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.		Board of Trustees
IVB1i The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.		Board of Trustees ALO

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IVB1j The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.		Board of Trustees
IVB2 The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.		President/ President's Office
IVB2a The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.		President/ President's Office
IVB2b The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following: establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities; ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions; ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.		President/ President's Office
IVB2c The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.		President/ President's Office

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IVB2d The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.		President/ President's Office
IVB2e The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.		President/ President's Office
IVB3 In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.		District Office
IVB3a The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.		District Office
IVB3b The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.		District Office
IVB3c The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.		District Office
IVB3d The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.		District Office
IVB3e The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without his/her interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.		District Office
IVB3f The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.		District Office

STANDARD SECTION	COMMITTEE LINKAGE	RELATED UNIT/DEPT.
IVB3g The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.		District Office

COMMENT
2012

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT
currently N/A (in future, possibly ISP)

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT
Academic Senate/FA interpretation?

COMMENT
evaluate processes/use of info from PBC, Faculty Hiring Prioritization, and Program Review

COMMENT

COMMENT
possibly PBC, once charge is revised

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

COMMENT

Las Positas College

Accreditation Midterm Report

Submitted to the

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2010

Insert Logo Here

3000 Campus Hill Drive

Livermore, CA 94551

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certification of Las Positas College Midterm Report ……. 2

Statement on Report Preparation ……..3

Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter ……4

Recommendation 1 A

Recommendation 1 B

Recommendation 2

Recommendation 3 A

Recommendation 3 B

Recommendation 4

Recommendation 5

College/District Recommendation 1

College/District Recommendation 2

Response to Self-Identified issues (Improvement Plans)

Appendices

CERTIFICATION OF LAS POSITAS COLLEGE MIDTERM REPORT

Date:

To: Accrediting Commission for community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Las Positas College
3000 Campus Hill Drive
Livermore, CA 94551

This Midterm Report certifies there was broad participation by the campus community and that the Midterm Report accurately responds to the Accrediting Commission's recommendations.

Signed,

_____
Interim Chancellor, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

_____
Isobel Dvorsky, President, Board of Trustees, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

_____
Dr. Kevin Walthers, President, Las Positas College

_____
Ms. Sarah Thompson, President, Las Positas College Academic Senate

_____
Mr. Todd Steffans, President, Las Positas College Classified Senate

_____
President, Associated Students of Las Positas College

STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

The Las Positas College Self-Study Report was completed and submitted to the Accrediting Commission for community and Junior colleges (ACCJC) for its site visit that occurred October 19 – 22, 2009.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges at its meeting on January 6 – 8, 2010 took action to reaffirm accreditation for Las Positas College, with the requirement that the College complete a Follow Up Report by October 15, 2010. The Commission required that the Follow Up Report demonstrate resolution of College Recommendation 3 and College Recommendation 4.

A Follow Up Report was completed and submitted to ACCJC in October 2010 that addressed Recommendation 3 A, 3 B, and 4.

This submission of the Midterm Report provides updated status of all Recommendations cited by the Commission during October 19 – 22, 2009 visit. The following narrative describes the process used to prepare this report and identifies those who were involved in its preparation.

During the Fall semester 2011, Accreditation teams were identified for each College and College/District recommendation. Each team consisted of representatives from all constituency groups on campus as well as representative as relevant from the District Office and Chabot College. Team members were selected based on their involvement in various governance activities throughout the college and district. For example, team leaders for the Recommendation 2 related to student learning outcomes and integrated planning included members of the Student Learning Outcomes Committee. Most members came to the Recommendation Teams with history and experience in the specific topic to be addressed.

Teams were provided a template that included the Recommendation to which each was to respond, a section for narrative regarding progress made toward compliance with the accreditation standard, analysis of that progress, and recommended examples of evidence designed to support claims of progress made since the Accreditation site visit. During spring 2012 semester, teams met at least monthly to determine progress made, analyze the progress, select evidence, and document their findings on the template. In May 2012, documents were collected by the Vice President of Academic Services for review and preparation for the author of the draft of the 2012 Midterm Report.

During summer 2012, Ms. Sarah Thompson, President of the Academic Senate authored the report, providing drafts to the Vice President of Academic Services for review. Upon completion of Midterm Report content, the Report was shared with the entire Las Positas College community on an electronic drive for review, feedback, and comments. This occurred during the month of September 2012. Concurrently, the document was provided to College Council and the Academic Senate for feedback which was incorporated prior to submission to

the Board of Trustees for review and approval. The following list identifies the members of the Recommendation teams:

Recommendation 1. A. Institutional Effectiveness

Team Leader: Bob Kratochvil

Team: Bob Kratochvil (Chair, Institutional Effectiveness committee)
Rajinder Samra – Institutional Research
Nan Ho – Faculty
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Recommendation 1B. Program Review, Planning and Governance Systems

Team Leader: Melissa Korber/Sarah Thompson

Team: Elena Cole, Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Sarah Thompson/Melissa Korber – Faculty
Rajinder Samra – Institutional Research
Janice Noble/VP Academic Services
Bob Kratochvil/VP Business Services
Jeff Baker/Interim VP Student Services
Todd Steffan - Classified
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Recommendation 2. Student Learning Outcomes

Team Leader: Richard Grow

Team: Richard Grow (SLO Committee Chair – Faculty)
Elena Cole – Faculty
Elizabeth Hopkins – Faculty
Janice Noble/VP Academic Services
Scott Vigallon – Classified
Amir Salazadeh – Student

Recommendation 3. A. Program Review (Update from October 2010 Follow-Up Report)

Team Leader: Elena Cole

Team: Bob Kratochvil (Chair, Institutional Effectiveness Committee)
Rajinder Samra (Institutional Research)
Nan Ho – Faculty
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Elena Cole – Faculty
Teri Henson – Faculty
Richard Grow – Faculty
Scott Vigallon
Jeff Baker

Recommendation 3.B. Administrative Program Review (Update from October 2010 Follow-Up Report)

Team Leader: Melissa Korber/Sarah Thompson

Team: Elena Cole, Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Sarah Thompson/Melissa Korber – Faculty
Rajinder Samra
Janice Noble/VP Academic Services
Todd Steffan – Classified
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Recommendation 4. Information Competency (Update from October 2010 Follow-Up Report)

Team Leader: Cheryl Warren

Team: Cheryl Warren – Faculty/Librarian
All librarians
Robin Roy – Faculty
Elizabeth Hopkins – Faculty
Maureen O' Herin – Faculty
Steve Gunderson – Classified

Recommendation 5. Ethics Code (Develop a written code of professional ethics for all personnel)

Team Leader: Janice Noble

District-wide Administrator Association
Jane McCoy – Faculty
LaVaughn Hart – Faculty
Greg Daubenmire – Faculty
Todd Stephen – Classified
Bill Eddy – Classified

DISTRICT AND COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 1. District/College Functions and Services

Team Leader: Kevin Walthers

Team: Bob D'Elena – Faculty
Kevin Walthers – President
Heidi Ulrech – Classified
Justin Garoupa – Faculty
John Gonder – Faculty
District Appointee
Chabot Appointee

DISTRICT AND COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 2. Resource Allocation Process

Team leader: Sarah Thompson

Team: Janice Noble/VP Academic Services LPC
George Railey/ VP Academic Services Chabot
Sarah Thompson, Academic Senate President LPC – Faculty
Kathy Kelley, Academic Senate President Chabot – Faculty
Lorenzo Legaspi – Vice Chancellor, Business Services

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2009 Visiting Team
Team Recommendations:
As a result of the October 2009 visit, the team made seven recommendations:

Recommendation #1
Institutional Effectiveness
To improve to a level of sustained continuous quality improvement the team recommends that:

A. The college increase its capacity for conducting research, fulfill its planning agenda with respect to institutional research and institutional effectiveness, and integrate institutional effectiveness research into planning through regular systemic evaluation of its progress toward achieving institutional goals. (I.B.3, I.B.4)
B. The college develop and implement on-going, systematic, college-wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its program review, planning and governance systems. (I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.5)

Progress Made – Recommendation 1A:

Capacity for Research

Despite facing the same budgetary challenges of every California Community College, Las Positas College (LPC) has been able to increase our research capacity. As a priority for the new President, this has been accomplished with a new researcher whose emphasis is solely on providing research data to faculty and staff. The primary reasons for our dramatic improvement in increasing our capacity are:

1. Hiring a Director of Research whose skill set matches the needs of the institution. He has vast experience in conducting research projects and has been able to generate our data and explain it in a manner that tells a clear "story" about our college. In his first semester he more than doubled the output of research inquiries for faculty and produced more than four times the prior year's research projects during his first year. The Director continued to improve his output by hiring a skilled grant funded assistant to increase the ability to meet current research needs.

2. Involving the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff in data gathering processes and sharing data with the staff so that the TLC staff is familiar with the information generated from the data and can in turn share the information with the faculty and staff during training sessions. The TLC staff members have assisted faculty and the Director of Research by supporting those who wish to develop surveys through the use of Survey Monkey and Google Survey to collect and analyze the data in order to conduct their own research.

3. Providing multiple training opportunities for faculty on how to initiate, and conduct his/her research. In addition to the support and learning opportunities offered to the faculty by the TLC, the Academic Senate, the Instructional Program Review Committee, and Staff Development Committee have hosted several Flex Days over the past two years to educate faculty on the types of data available, how to request data for specific projects, how to conduct original research, and specifically how to assess program level data.

Planning Agenda for Institutional Effectiveness

In 2009 – 2010 academic year, LPC created an overarching strategic planning/institutional effectiveness program review model slated for implementation in 2010 – 2011 academic year. The model demonstrates the effectiveness of the college's ability to collaborate with different constituency groups and support the college's overall improvement. Most of the challenges from the new model fall into five categories.

1. The number of goals established for the college. Ten goals were established for the college and were the outcome of inspirational thinking. Discussions have ensued in several committees including College Council and Institutional Effectiveness Committee for the need to streamline and take a more practical and realistic approach to goal setting for the college. With new emphasis in the past two years on student success, goals must include this very important topic.

2. Prioritized goals for action. There is only one goal for the college that emphasizes teaching and learning. The remaining goals have not been prioritized for implementation and many are qualitative in nature and difficult to measure for success.

3. A strategic planning process designed to meet internal time frames. Initially the Strategic Planning process included three steps: gather college-wide input; vet ideas/strategies about how to meet each goal; and share the outcome of the expert committees with the college community to focus our efforts for the college's next five years. Due to administrative turnover, the second step did not take place and the Strategic Plan was published with more than 100 Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for the college to implement.

4. Implementation of a large number of Key Performance Indicators (KPI). The newly formed Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) was charged with tracking and monitoring the progress of these college-wide indicators. The task was daunting with too much data and far too much to track for the committee to be effective in its work. In addition, accreditation standards and state compliance issues were not included in the initial draft and were integrated after publication.

5. Processes required of committees were not fully developed and implemented within the current structure of the committees. Three committees were identified as the main oversight bodies for the new integrated planning and institutional effectiveness model. Each was assigned a role for the processes. College Council was to set goals for the institution; Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) was to implement spending priorities based on goals developed by college council; and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the processes was assigned to Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). While an effective division of labor, these assignments did not fully reflect the manner in which each committee operated at the time. The intention was to review and revise the charge for each committee over the ensuing years.

   When the new set of expectations for the committee was developed and moved to implementation, College Council had been defined as primarily an informative committee for the College President. All constituency leaders and key committee chair persons attended College Council to exchange information and coordinate college-wide projects. An example of a project is the Governance Handbook that over the course of three years was approved through all constituency groups despite multiple changes in administration leadership. In hindsight, this committee was not the best choice to assign planning tasks. In 2010, College Council recommended that Institutional Effectiveness Committee be tasked with goal setting as a result of their evaluation process outcomes.

   The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) has as its primary function funds allocation for Instructional Equipment, and prioritization of the institution's needs for non-instructional personnel, e.g. classified and administrative staff. Over the past three years, the committee membership has become more closely aligned with the district and college budget challenges. PBC members that are not part of the District Budget Study Group (DBSG) receive reports from this district based committee through those members on both committees. PBC has not been tasked with planning activities for the college. Other fund allocation committees on campus include Faculty Prioritization, Basic Skills, and Staff Development committees. Members of these committees do not have membership on the PBC so the task of prioritization of funds is a complex process.

   Institutional Effectiveness Committee is the College's newest committee. Formed two years ago, it is finding its way with the support of the increased capacity provided by institutional research data. The maturing process of this committee is occurring as more data are available for analysis and decision-making. Recommendations at the year-end meeting include review of the number of college-wide goals needed to achieve success; adhere to all steps in order to assure broad support from constituency groups during

planning processes; and incorporate student success measures into evaluation processes.

Integrating institutional effectiveness research into planning through regular systematic evaluation

Las Positas College has seen great success with the integration of research into planning through regular systematic evaluation at the instructional and non-instructional program level. Programs have used Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and completion data to initiate curricular changes. Most notable is the success the Writing Program's analysis of learning/completion outcomes of accelerated versus non-accelerated courses. Findings reveal no significant statistical difference in success rates. Since accelerated courses support student completion and matriculation, the Writing Program increased the number of accelerated course offerings.

As the Institutional Effectiveness Committee continues to mature in its ability to integrate research findings into planning, LPC will find an increasing number of opportunities to use data-driven decisions to improve planning and foster student success and completion.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 1A

Capacity for Research

LPC is confident we have met the requirement of Recommendation 1A through the support of college leadership from all constituency groups taking intentional and deliberate actions. Through the dedicated actions of a new Director of Research, his assistant, and staff from the Teaching and Learning Center, the capacity for meaningful research that supports the mission of the college has been increased and is now fostering the training of "champions" to support others as they begin the journey of research-based program planning.

Planning Agenda for Institutional Effectiveness

As described above, the institutional model initiated in 2009 was implemented with modest success due in part with multiple changes in campus leadership that required time to understand and support the manner in which the college functioned. This reality has hampered the college's ability to move forward as rapidly as anticipated in 2009.

Las Positas College may also be victims of our own college culture. We have a culture of respect and autonomy and generally allow committees to function independently, assuming those in committee and constituency leadership roles know their duties and responsibilities best. However, since we are working toward changing our practices to link assessment to

planning and outcomes with evaluation, this tradition of independence may not serve us well at this moment in our college's development.

The college's operational structure regarding research may not be aligned in the most effective manner. Discussion has ensued to develop two separate entities – Planning and Research. These entities would be interconnected but be able to work effectively to support the research needs and the planning processes that support student learning. A Director of Planning would help integrate planning and allocation committees and ensure college priorities are communicated and implemented.

LPC goals are:

1. Review, and revise if needed, the college mission and vision statements and streamline and reformulate college goals. A formal request by Academic Senate has been made to begin this process and the administrative team has currently submitted a proposal to move the college forward in this endeavor.

2. Revisit the college's strategic goals to ensure they are aligned with student learning outcomes and completion expectations. The current strategic plan is a testimony to the college community's ability to work collaboratively; however, the sheer volume of action items is an unwieldy tool for planning and achievement.

3. Reevaluate the Institutional Effectiveness model taking into account the progress made and the successes accomplished at the program level. This process will consider areas for improvement such as the assignment of roles to committees not designed to function in those capacities. While the college is loathed to begin another committee while we are downsizing our faculty, staff, and administrators, it is willing to do so as an essential step toward accomplishing our institutional goals and improvement plans.

LPC believes that after working with the existing model and making revisions to it as well as implementing the planned review and revision processes in 2012 for the college's mission, goals, and strategic plan, we have successfully met the requirements of this part of the accreditation standard.

Evidence

1) Capacity for Research
    a. Spreadsheet of projects over the past few years (Rajinder says he has this)
    b. SLO analysis program reviews and updates – where can we get this?
    c. Flex day/ TLC workshop agendas
2) Fulfill its planning agenda with respect to institutional research

a. Goals, Vision and Mission statements
b. Original minutes and models from the Common Ground Committee
c. Revamped model from Trifecta last year
d. Strategic Plan
e. IE minutes with discussions of challenges with KPIs highlighted
f. Minutes from PBC and College Council with discussion re: IE role highlighted

3) Integrate Institutional Effectiveness Research into Planning
    a. The English department's meeting minutes – the schedule of course offerings before and after before and after
    b. English department's program review

Progress Made – Recommendation 1B:

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of program review

Prior to our 2009 Accreditation site visit, our Program Review Committee was an ad-hoc Academic Senate Committee. The Committee is now a fully sanctioned standing Academic Senate Committee with contractually assured reassigned time for its chair(s). The college's program review process has also expanded to include all Non-Instructional areas e.g. Division Offices, President's Office, and Student Services. While the Instructional Program Review Committee is freestanding from the areas of Non-Instruction and Student Services, discussion have begun this year to see if the college might be better served by an all encompassing Program Review Committee, as all three areas now conduct program reviews.

Our last Program Review Full Report Cycle began in 2010 – it was all inclusive (all instructional, non-instructional and student service programs participated). This meant a great deal of work for Program Review Committee Members, but the college wanted full program updates and universal feedback from all sectors. There were numerous workshops and online help for faculty and staff to complete their first draft of the Program Review. Program Review mentors read each document and provided feedback and recommended additions and changes to the authors. Once the authors believed the document was an accurate reflection of their program's history, current status, and goals, each author was asked to complete a summary document indicating the program's maintenance and development needs. This document is known as "The Common Tool". The Common Tool identifies the fiscal and non-fiscal needs of each program. It is a method used to evaluate the college needs as a whole. For example, it could answer the question, "How many programs need a new or replacement Classified position? Or "How many programs need to update their Course Outlines of Record to current Title V standards"?

In the Spring of 2011 the Program Review Committee sent out a survey to faculty soliciting feedback on the new process. In general, faculty appreciated the template, but overwhelmingly stated a need for greater access to data. The Committee and the previous Director of Research outlined a plan to meet this need through automating more general course level data. The Committee also identified a need to train faculty in how to gather targeted data themselves. Solutions, many outlined in the response to Recommendation 1A, have been successfully implemented.

In Spring 2011, a Flex Day was set aside to update Program Reviews, primarily to capture changes in data, and guide faculty further in assessment of their Student Learning Outcomes. Currently we are planning a research project to compare the level of data assessment of the original Program Reviews and the updated Program Reviews to see if practices are changing as a consequence of the training faculty have received.

In Fall 2011 the various allocation committees on campus (Faculty Hiring Prioritization, Planning and Budget, Staff Development, etc.) evaluated their application forms and amended them to make Program Review data the central consideration for funding. Some committees required the entire Program Review in addition to their application/request form, while others required critical parts of program Review and included those in the application itself. These committees, in turn, gave feedback to the Program Review Committee as to the effectiveness of the information and format of the current Program Review document, with the goal of having the process so efficient and streamlined that eventually the Program Review document itself would become the "application" for different forms of funding.

The biggest challenge our Program Review Process is facing is how to validate the Program Review content requests for new faculty, equipment, facilities, etc. Since there are fewer non-Instructional and Student Services Program Reviews, administrators in these areas are able to provide validation for these documents. A challenge to the process is the number of instructional programs, and too few administrators and faculty familiar with various subjects to serve as a check and balance system in this part of the process. At the beginning of 2012, the Program Review Committee took the issue of validation on, culminating in a proposal submitted to the Academic Senate and College Council. This proposal identified the College Council as the validation committee. The proposal is currently under consideration by the College Council.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of planning

In Spring 2010, our Director of Research conducted a college wide survey to understand how knowledgeable our college community was about our strategic planning process. In additional, general questions were asked about the effectiveness of our strategic planning process. The responses revealed that less than half of our community agreed that they understood our college goals or strategic plan. Yet, despite this, many understood that our strategic plan was linked to our program planning. The results of this survey were not run until early 2011, and no action was taken to respond to this survey.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of governance

We currently survey staff every 6 years to assess our governance systems, with the next survey scheduled in 2013. The Director of Research plans to work with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to increase the frequency of these surveys to a more meaningful timeframe. This decision is the result of the new emphasis on meaningful research.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 1B

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of program review

Overall, we have done well with our assessment of Program Review. LPC community is proud of and grateful for a very dedicated Program Review committee and its leadership. Over the past few years the committee membership has solicited and received feedback, and has responded with diligence to its constituents. We believe we have successfully met the requirements of this recommendation.

The challenge faced today is how to accurately validate the requests that emerge from the Program Review Process. Until we have a method for this, it will be difficult to truly integrate Instructional Program Review into institutional level planning. Some funding committees feel ill-at-ease using program reviews as the basis for allocation, as they feel inadequate to judge the validity of the needs of fellow faculty, staff members, etc. Greater trust could be generated by a process that takes away that doubt.

In Recommendation 1A it was stated that there is a need for a Director of Planning to integrate strategic planning, allocation, and accreditation. The Director could also oversee the validation process for Program Reviews.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of planning

The administrative turnover has led to frequent reprioritization of tasks. The current campus leadership took proactive steps to establish a systematic sustainable process. We are fortunate to have a Director of Research who has been able to complete projects from past years. It will

likely mean some of the data that has been collected in the past two to three years is outdated and will need to be re-gathered for a meaningful response to be implemented.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of governance

Strong support will be given to increasing the frequency of reliable and valid staff surveys to determine the effectiveness of the governance processes currently in place.

LPC goals are:

1. Design and implement a valid and reliable method of assuring that all Program Review requests reflect the true needs of each program and non-instructional sector
2. Re-evaluate existing staff survey data to determine its relevance to the current college community environment
3. Increase the frequency with which the governance effectiveness survey data is collected
4. Continue to increase the staff development and education for the college community related to research design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation, and implementation of program improvements

Evidence

Program Review charge (from Governance handbook)

Program Review Templates – instructional, non-instructional, student services

Sample of each Program Review

Sample feedback sheets – mentors

Common Tool Template

Sample common tool forms – maintenance and development

Common Tool spreadsheet

Results – faculty survey 2011

Applications from Faculty Prioritization, Staff Development, PBC

Feedback sheets from committees

Validation proposal from Program Review

Results – staff survey on strategic planning

Recommendation #2

Student Learning Outcomes

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, and to achieve a level of proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes, the team recommends that the college fully engage both full time and adjunct faculty in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, and establish and achieve institutional timelines for completing student learning outcomes assessments for all its courses, programs and services. Emphasis should be placed on encouraging institutional dialog about assessment results, rather than dialog about the Student Learning Outcome Assessment process. The institution should focus on the use of assessment results for quality assurance and improvement of educational programming to improve student learning, as well as inform planning and resource allocation decisions.

Progress Made – Recommendation 2:

Engaging both full time and part time faculty in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Significant progress has been made this past year in the creation and measurement of Student Learning Outcomes. This was largely facilitated by the contractual agreement to compensate adjuncts to participate in the SLO process. In January of 2012, 74% of courses had SLOs – by May, the SLO rate was at 92%. SLO assessment documentation also jumped during the same time period. In January, 49% of course-level Student Learning Outcomes were being assessed and by May that had risen to 61%. This number is even more significant when one considers that due to work load reduction, some of our courses were not offered in the past year; therefore, assessments could not be completed.

The increase in recording and assessment of SLOs also reflected improvements made to our software system by our Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff. Faculty have registered concerns over the years that our SLO management system, eLumen, was not user-friendly and limited in its ability to analyze data. The eLumen vendor made the software easier for faculty to use. The TLC staff also create web forms which would allow instructors to avoid the software interaction altogether.

Establish and achieve institutional timelines for completing student learning outcomes assessment for all courses, programs, and services

In December 2011, the Student Learning Outcome Committee announced the goal of having 100% course level SLO compliance by the end of the academic year. Although the college did not quite reach this goal, excellent progress was made through this endeavor. Having worked diligently to come to proficiency on the course SLO level, we are still in the development stage for the creation and assessment of Program Level SLOs. Currently, 53% of programs have defined SLOs, and 31% of all programs are actively assessing their SLOs. There are plans to improve the statistics related to program SLOs. Some non-instructional programs are struggling with the measurability of their SLOs, and are currently in dialogue about how best to redefine the SLOs based on desired student learning.

Encourage dialog about assessment results rather than process

In 2010, the college identified Program Review document as the primary vehicle for reporting and analyzing the results of SLO assessments. Over the past two years, SLO data became more embedded into the Program Review process, with the Spring 2012 Program Review updates emphasizing SLO analysis. The Spring 2012 Faculty Flex Day was used exclusively as an "Assessment Day", with poster workshops where participants created models of SLO measurement, assessment, implementation, and reassessment.

The College found that having Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes as two distinctly separate committees needs to be evaluated in the future. In 2010, the meeting times were changed so they could collaborate more easily.

Use assessment results to improve student learning

Business, Math, and English have been identified as the model programs for implementing curricular changes in response to SLO assessment. Data are now more readily available to support the identification of how many of our programs, Degrees, or Certificates are actively using SLO data in their curricular planning.

Use assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation decisions

In 2011-2012, allocation committees across campus have either continued or begun to require SLO assessment in their application process and forms. Most allocation committees currently require that requests be rooted in the discipline/program's Program Review document. The Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes committees have also made a general request to allocating committees that they not only require SLOs as a foundation for funding, but also

engage in follow up evaluation the following year as to the impact of the funding on student learning outcomes.

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) planning consultant, gkkWorks, used current Program Review documents as the basis to compile the current draft of the District and individual College Educational Master Plan. While the Consultants did not specifically use SLOs to create the draft Educational Master Plan, the SLOs were embedded in the Program Review process and documents supplied to the consultants.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 2:

Engaging both full time and part time faculty in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Providing compensation for adjunct faculty to participate in SLO assessment was a major achievement as a result of the most recent Faculty Association contract negotiations. This next year should see even more significant improvement in both measurement and assessment of course level SLOs. The SLO Committee has identified a future goal in 2012-2013 to improve mapping for course and program level SLOs to our Institutional Core Competencies. The SLO management system, eLumen requires users to designate which core competency the SLO is mapped to upon entering a new outcome for assessment.

One challenge faced with faculty participation is internalizing the value of Student Learning Outcomes as a mechanism for continuous improvement. There is still reluctance on the part of many faculty members to fully engage in the SLO process. Most comply out of a sense of obligation, but campus leadership struggles to help programs find meaningful outcomes of their assessments. We have discovered that our SLO management system, eLumen, has also fed into this issue by being somewhat limiting in what it can effectively assess. The SLO Committee has allowed faculty to create their own rubric, but this rubric offers a limited structure; the score options are a 0-4 scale. The College should consider outreach education to faculty to foster creative alternatives to the eLumen model so SLOs become an internalized and valued part of the student learning and faculty teaching process.

The same reluctance is not apparent in Student Services or Non-Instructional personnel, but it may be because they have only recently created their outcome objectives. Student Services faculty and staff have discovered that the SLOs initially developed are not easily quantifiable, so they are re-evaluating their set of outcomes to transform them into Service Area Outcomes (SAO).

Establish and achieve institutional timelines for completing student learning outcomes assessment for all courses, programs, and services

The goal of 100% compliance for all courses, degrees, and certificate for the 2011-2012 academic year was successful at 92%, and demonstrated significant improvement. Similar goals need to be set each year, and these goals need to be incorporated and validated by our fund allocation sources consistently. Through various venues, intentional and deliberate steps were taken to engage faculty to gain their support in the development, implementation, and assessment processes for documenting Student Learning Outcomes.

Encourage dialogue about assessment results rather than process

The success demonstrated by Business, Math, and English is serving as an encouraging model for other disciplines. (Insert the results of the Program Review update here)

Use assessment results to improve student learning

Disciplines have been meeting to dialogue about student assessments, for example English, Math, and Business. The Flex Days in Spring 2012 and Fall 2011 provided time for the disciplines to meet and discuss the assessment results. There have also been department meetings focused on improving student results through the assessments. The English department met over the 2011-12 academic year and Math plans on meeting Fall 2012. Dialogue will continue across the disciplines to address the students learning needs.

Use assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation decisions

The College continues to improve the use of SLO assessment results for planning and resource allocation decisions. A challenge to validating SLO work is no consequences result from not doing effective SLO development, implementation, and assessment. Some allocating committees require an SLO analysis and support of their request, while others do not. For example, the Las Positas College Foundation does not require SLO results to support a request for funding. Many assume that since SLOs are embedded in Program Review documents, that they are indirectly included in requests for funds. Yet, since the level of sophistication in using assessment data to allocate resources based on this data has not matured to the degree desired, it is not valid to state SLO assessments wholly inform planning and resource allocation. While the college wants to avoid duplication of work (e.g. have forms which require program review and SLO assessment), it may be necessary until we perfect the SLO analysis in our program reviews. The intention is to replicate the successes experienced in those allocation committees to the entire campus.

LPC goals are:

1. Promote internalization of the value of student learning outcomes in the teaching and learning process and planning and allocation processes.

2. Begin evaluation of fund allocation impact on future student learning outcomes.

3. Continue actively pursuing 100 % compliance with course, degree, and certificate SLOs.

Evidence:

1) Teaching and Learning Center Data on SLO Progress
2) eLumen web form
3) Spring 2012 Town Hall Reports
4) Outcomes of Program Review Update of Spring 2012
5) Poster sessions – Business, Math, English
6) Allocation forms from committees that do use SLO data – e.g. PBC Instructional equipment
7) Request from Program Review re: follow up questions
8) Draft Educational Master Plan

Recommendation #3

Program Review

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:

A. The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning. (I.B.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)

B. The college fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services. (I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.D.3)

Progress Made – Recommendation 3A:

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review

As described in the *Accreditation Follow-Up Report*, submitted October 2010, the college revised the program review self-study to capture evidence of programs' assessments of student learning. All instructional programs at Las Positas College completed program review in Fall 2010. The newly formed Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) evaluated the program reviews. The evaluation process involved IPRC members offering feedback to the authors about the strength of the data and information provided, including each program's assessment of student learning outcomes. The defined process was followed; however, some members were uncomfortable commenting on the quality of SLO work done by the different disciplines. The IPRC met with the Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLOC) in a meeting in March 2011 to discuss programs' progress on SLOs to date and strategize ways to support further progress.

In Fall 2011, the IPRC and the SLO Committee held several joint meetings to develop an annual program review update form which focused on capturing programs' SLO work, particularly identifying ways each program serves students. In addition, the IPRC and the SLOC, working together as is stated in the IPRC's charge, also supported the efforts of the Staff Development Committee to plan the March 29, 2012 flex day. The flex day activities required participants to engage in dialogue about their SLO work through the vehicle of poster sessions, and examine the role of LPC's Core Competencies in relation to student transcripts.

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for planning

Las Positas College has worked with intention and commitment to integrate program review into planning. (See Response to Recommendation 1A). In the 2010-2011 academic year, the Director of Research and Planning, along with the IPRC, developed the "Common Tool". This

document was envisioned to be the method the college used to develop a long term planning process. The Common Tool is a spreadsheet snapshot of needs compiled from all program review documents – Instructional, Non-Instructional and Student Services sectors. The Common Tool was divided into two different types of needs: Those required to maintain the program, and those required to develop the program.

Despite the complexity of the Common Tool, there were some weaknesses in this model that were detected. First, since there is no process for validating the content of the program review (no process to see if the data merited the needs requests), all items on maintenance and development forms were included in the spreadsheet. Second, the lack of ability to validate the requests with data, made prioritization of needs difficult. The Director of Research spent several weeks compiling the Common Tool and when complete, it was cumbersome to use as a tool for college planning.

We have been more successful in integrating program review into the various allocation processes at the college. Most allocating committees use some element of program review in the application process. Two allocation committees, Faculty Prioritization and Staff Development, require the entire program review be submitted with a request for resources. Yet, without any form of institutional prioritization, allocating committees are left with judging the quality of program reviews based on their authors' ability to write and provide statistical supporting data rather than funding toward specific college goals.

This issue in the process was addressed in the "Program Review Roundtable" held in January 2012. Faculty and Administrators gathered to discuss the effectiveness of the current Program Review Model and how it integrated into the overall planning and resource allocation process. As a result of the discussions at the roundtable, the IPRC presented a new model for integrating Program Review into the Institutional Effectiveness Model to the College Council in Spring 2012.

This proposed model differs from the original model developed by the Common Ground Committee of 2010 (the creators of the original Institutional Effectiveness model) in several ways. First, the group identified College Council as the lead in reading program reviews and setting institutional priorities. Second, College Council is to be the committee responsible for communicating these college priorities to all allocating committees. Third, Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) is removed from the process. Fourth, a new committee of Deans and IPRC members is to be created to validate the program reviews before they are viewed by the College Council, and finally, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) evaluates the entire process.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 3A:

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review

As outlined in the response to Recommendation 2, our SLO assessment has significantly increased since 2009. Integrating SLOs assessment data and analysis into the program review process greatly contributed to this achievement. The challenge still before the college is evaluating the effectiveness and validity of the SLOs data. Since it is the IRPC's responsibility to read Program Reviews, the SLO Committee membership is not formally involved in the evaluation of SLOs used in Program Reviews. An effective process for SLO evaluation requires both committees to collaborate. It is planned that these two committees will merge in the next academic year, making this piece of the process more effective.

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for planning

The Common Tool remains a good concept, but the program reviews need thorough vetting prior to their requests being placed in the document. It would help, as well, to have projections built into the Program Review/Common Tool process. Currently there was no timeline for when development resources were needed – next year, next month, or tomorrow. This problem reveals yet again the need for a validation step in our program review process. The college-wide process would require more depth and understanding of individual program to use this process for effective planning for resources allocation.

The Institutional Effectiveness model developed by the IPRC reflects this need. Yet, there are challenges to their recommendations as well. As outlined in Recommendation 1A, College Council serves mostly as an information exchange. Taking on the broad responsibility of reading programs review documents and conducting the rich discussion required to integrate the outcomes of program review, accreditation needs, and state mandates in the framework of our college goals is a major shift of responsibilities for this committee.

In addition, with recent budget cuts, the college has reduced administrative staff from 6 deans to 4 (3 academic, 1 student services). Work load for administrators has exponentially increased over the past year. The college no longer has a dean of Counseling and Matriculation and the Vice President of Student Services serves in that capacity. It remains to be seen if this group will be able to serve as a validation team with the IPRC representatives.

A Director of Planning as outlined in the response to Recommendation 1A would significantly streamline and solidify the validation and evaluation of effectiveness for this process. This administrator would take the lead in facilitating the Planning Committee and the Program Review Validation team. These committees would then be integrated into the IPRC's Institutional Effectiveness model.

Evidence:

i. Accreditation Follow Up Report of 2010
ii. Instructional Program Review Self Study – Fall 2009-2010

iii. Several examples of the self study
iv. Example of Feedback from Program Review evaluation
v. Agenda and minutes from joint SLO/Program Review committee meetings
vi. Program Review update form 2012
vii. March 29 Flex Day agenda
viii. Examples of English, Math and Business Poster Sessions
ix. Response to Recommendation 1A
x. Common Tool
xi. Form for Program Maintenance
xii. Form for Program Development
xiii. District Education and Facilities Master Plan
xiv. Faculty Prioritization and Staff Development request forms
xv. Program Review Roundtable Agenda and Minutes
xvi. Program Review's IE Model
xvii. Response to Recommendation 2

Recommendation #3

Program Review

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:

A. The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning. (I.B.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)

B. The college fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services. (I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.D.3)

Progress Made – Recommendation 3B:

The College Fully Implement a Program Review Process for All Administrative Programs and Services

As described in the *Accreditation Follow-Up Report*, submitted October 2010, the college implemented its first program reviews for non-instructional and student services areas. All programs reviews have been completed and updated. The original structure using Instructional Program Review as a separate process has created some challenges. An area that is being worked on through collaboration is connecting program requests from all sectors into the Common Tool for updates, planning models, mentoring, etc. Having separate groups assess the different areas of Program Review document has created additional work for Program Review coordinators.

Non-instructional Program Review has completed one cycle and these documents have been reviewed by the Vice President of the sector and are housed with Institutional Research. Each non-instructional program review was also required to submit Program Development and Maintenance forms and add their requests to the Common Tool. This information on the Common Tool was distributed to several key committees throughout the college governance structure as a document to aid in hiring decisions, resource allocation, and planning.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 3 B:

The College Fully Implement a Program Review Process for All Administrative Programs and Services

The college has made significant progress in this area and believes it has successfully met the Accreditation standard. Discussions are now underway about how to integrate Student Services and Non-Instructional Program Review into the Instructional Program Review Committee. The Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) currently serves as an Academic Senate Sub-Committee, and has been successful in the past in developing lines of communication/reporting

structures in these instances (for example, our Staff Development Committee is not an Academic Senate Subcommittee as they service the entire campus's staff development).

Evidence:

1) Accreditation Follow Up Report
2) Examples – non-instructional and student services program reviews
3) Common Tool
4) Minutes – College Council re: Staff Development
5) Agenda/Minutes Fall 2012 Program Review Meeting – September 12

Recommendation # 4
Information Competency

To meet the standards the team recommends that the college use campus-wide dialog to develop ongoing instruction for users of library and learning support services to ensure students develop skills in Information Competency. (II.C.1.b)

Progress Made – Recommendation 4

Ensuring Students Develop Skills in Information Competency

In our Accreditation Follow Up Report the college outlined the dialogue and planning that took place to embed Information Competency curriculum into required or highly enrolled Freshmen courses. Two pilot programs – in Health 1 and English 1A were completed in Fall 2010. Faculty members from both courses continue to use multiple library orientations as tested in the Pilot. Both courses assess Information Competency in their Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)s. Library Faculty members meet frequently with Health and English faculty to review outcomes and make adjustments as necessary.

In addition, Library Faculty members meet regularly with Counseling Faculty to outline new coursework, workshops, and resources to recommend to their students. Currently the college offers two Library classes. One is structured as a 10-week, 2 credit class (LBR 8), and the other involves an intense workshop – four courses at .5 credits each (LBR 4-7). These courses are offered in 3 week sessions. The SLOs in all Library classes are continually assessed.

Finally, our Librarians have offered to incorporate information competency curriculum in any discipline that requests such assistance. This is accomplished by the Librarian meeting with the faculty member to analyze assignments and offer the curricular and orientation support to promote student success. To date, courses in Business, Chemistry, College Foundation Semester, Health, Microbiology, Political Science, Sociology and Zoology have “embedded” librarians.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 4

Ensuring Students Develop Skills in Information Competency

Our librarians engage in continuous dialogue with Instructional Faculty and Counselors in order to best support students in their studies, the college has met the requirements in the Accreditation standard for dialogue to create Information Competency learning support

services. The program is no longer in its developmental stage and now functions in a continuous cycle of assessment and improvement.

Evidence:

1) Accreditation Follow Up Report of October 15 2010
2) Course Outlines, SLOS for English 1A and Health 1
3) Library Guides for Information Competency (located on library homepage)

Recommendation #5
Ethics Code

To meet the standards the team recommends that the college develop a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel. (III.A.1.d)

Progress Made – Recommendation 5:

The College Develops a Written Code of Professional Ethics

As two constituency groups, Faculty and Classified, are represented by collective bargaining units, the college approached this recommendation using the current collective bargaining structure. Each professional category (Administrators, Faculty, and Classified) met to discuss and develop a code of ethics that met their constituency group's specific needs.

Administrators discussed and developed an ethics code over the course of several Administrative Staff Meetings. As we had administrative turnover over the past few years, the document was prepared in 2010 – 11 and was reviewed and updated in 2011 – 12. In each case, all administrators signed the document as an indicator of support and compliance with its content and meaning.

In the 2008-2009 academic year the Faculty Association (the Faculty collective bargaining unit) drafted language for an ethics code using contract language. The Academic Senate approved the document. In Spring 2012 the Faculty Association revised the document to reflect changes in the current contract language. Again, the Academic Senate approved this document.

The Classified Senate took the lead on the development of the Classified Ethics Code. The process was inclusive, and changes were adapted to meet the concerns/corrections given to the Senate by the LPC Classified Staff.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 5:

The College Develops a Written Code of Professional Ethics

The college has met the requirements of this Accreditation standard for this recommendation. Each has numerous areas of overlap and all insist on mutual respect for colleagues and students. The themes of honesty and integrity are included in all three Code of Ethics documents.

Evidence:

1) Administrators Code of Ethics
2) Faculty Code of Ethics
3) Classified Code of Ethics

Draft

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

COLLEGE STATUS REPORT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IMPLEMENTATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Colleges are asked to use this report form in completing their *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation*. Colleges should submit a brief narrative analysis and quantitative and qualitative evidence demonstrating status of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) implementation. The report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric). Colleges are asked to interpret their implementation level through the lens of the Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. The final report section before the evidence list requests a brief narrative self-assessment of overall status in relationship to the proficiency level, indicating what plans are in place to mitigate any noted deficiencies or areas for improvement. **Narrative responses for each section of the template should not exceed 250 words.**

This report form offers examples of quantitative and qualitative evidence which might be included for each of the characteristics. The examples are illustrative in nature and are not intended to provide a complete listing of the kinds of evidence colleges may use to document SLO status. College evidence used for one Proficiency level characteristic may also serve as evidence for another characteristic.

This report is provided to colleges in hard copy and also electronically, by e-mail, as a fill-in Word document. The reports must be submitted to the Commission by either the October 15, 2012 date or the March 15, 2013 date, as defined on the enclosed list of colleges by assigned reporting date. When the report is completed, colleges should:

a. Submit the report form by email to the ACCJC (accjc@accjc.org); **and**

b. Submit the full report *with attached evidence* on CD/DVD to the ACCJC (ACCJC, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949).

Although evidence cited in the text of the report may include links to college web resources, the Commission requires actual copies (electronic files) of the evidence for its records.

COLLEGE INFORMATION: DATE OF REPORT; COLLEGE; SUBMITTED BY; CERTIFICATION BY CEO

Date of Report: September 15 2012

Institution's Name: Las Positas College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Janice Noble, Ph. D. ,Vice President of Academic Services

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (925) 424-1103

Certification by Chief Executive Officer: *The information included in this report is certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.*

Name of CEO: Kevin Walthers
Signature:_____
(e-signature permitted)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS ARE IN PLACE FOR COURSES, PROGRAMS, SUPPORT SERVICES, CERTIFICATES AND DEGREES.

Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement
Standards: I.A.1; II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; II.A.3 [See II.A.3.a,b,c.]; II.A.6; II.B.4; II.C.2].

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Evidence demonstrating numbers/percentages of course, program (academic and student services), and institutional level outcomes are in place and assessed. Documentation on institutional planning processes demonstrating integrated planning and the way SLO assessment results impact program review. Descriptions could include discussions of high-impact courses, gateway courses, college frameworks, and so forth.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NUMERICAL RESPONSE
QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE/DATA ON THE RATE/PERCENTAGE OF SLOS DEFINED AND ASSESSED

1. Courses
   a. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 728
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 669
      Percentage of total: 92%
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 447
      Percentage of total: 61%
2. Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 98
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 52;
      Percentage of total: 53%
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 30;
      Percentage of total: 31%
3. Student Learning and Support Activities
   a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 16
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 14;
      Percentage of total: 88%
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 10; Percentage of total: 63%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 5
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 5

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

PROGRESS WAS MADE IN WRITING AND ASSESSMENT OF (SLOS) OVER THE PAST YEAR. AN INCENTIVE WAS THE ADDITION TO THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION CONTRACT TO COMPENSATE ADJUNCT FACULTY FOR THEIR WORK WITH FULL TIME FACULTY TO INITIATE, ASSESS, AND DOCUMENT THE CYCLE OF SLOS AND ASSESSMENTS THROUGH OUR DATABASE, ELUMEN . (1.1, 1.2, 1.3) BEGINNING IN DECEMBER 2011, THE COLLEGE TRACKED AND REPORTED ALL DISCIPLINE AND DIVISION MONTHLY PROGRESS TOWARD 100% COMPLETION OF SLOS AND THEIR ASSESSMENT. (1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7)

IMPROVEMENT EVIDENCE WAS REPORTED THROUGH MONTHLY TOWN HALL MEETINGS AND/OR THROUGH THE WEEKLY PUBLICATION DONE BY THE ALO THROUGH THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC SERVICES TITLED *ACCREDITATION THIS WEEK.* (1.8) IN JANUARY, IT WAS REPORTED THAT THE COLLEGE SLOS WERE AT 74% AND ASSESSMENTS WERE AT 49%. THROUGH THE COURSE OF THE SEMESTER, MANY ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBERS PARTICIPATED WITH FULL TIME FACULTY SUPPORT TO IMPROVE THE SLO RATE TO ITS CURRENT 92% WITH ASSESSMENTS IMPROVING FROM 49% TO 61%. MANY COURSES WERE NOT OFFERED RECENTLY DUE TO THE DECREASE IN THE CLASS SCHEDULE OFFERINGS; THEREFORE, ASSESSMENTS WERE NOT COMPLETED.

STUDENT SERVICES FOUND THE SLOS THEY HAD DEVELOPED WERE DIFFICULT TO MEASURE. THEY HAVE BEGUN TO DEVELOP STUDENT AREA OUTCOMES (SAOS) WHICH THEY BELIEVE WILL PROVIDE MORE MEANINGFUL DATA. (1.9)

ONE-ON-ONE EDUCATION AND SUPPORT WAS PROVIDED THROUGH THE TEACHING AND LEARNING CENTER FOR FULL AND PART TIME FACULTY AND STUDENT SERVICES ON SLOS, DEVELOPMENT OF ASSESSMENT CRITERIA, AND DOCUMENTATION INTO THE DATABASE SYSTEM. DIALOGUE ENSUED IN MONTHLY TOWN HALL MEETINGS AND A FLEX DAY ACTIVITY DISCUSSED THE CORE COMPETENCIES AND MAPPING COURSES TO THEM. (1.10)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: THERE IS A WIDESPREAD INSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE ABOUT ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS.

Standards: I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.5.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on processes and outcomes of SLO assessment. Specific examples with the outcome data analysis and description of how the results were used. Descriptions could include examples of institutional changes made to respond to outcomes assessment results.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Data has been collected in the eLumen database for over five years. Through a year-long dialogue, Program Review process was updated, revised, and implemented that included a discussion of the results of SLO assessments into the design of the Program Review. (2.1)

There were two Flex Day activities in Spring 2012 and one in Fall 2011. The Spring 2012 workshop featured poster workshops where participants created models of SLO development, assessment, and implementation of changes in curriculum based on findings. The spring semester Flex Day was used as an Assessment Day. Part of the day was devoted to a dialogue to review of the institution's core competencies for relevance. The second part was a discussion within individual disciplines about findings related to individual disciplines' course, degree, and certificate SLOs and what each plans to do in the future. (see 1.10) (2.2)

The Program Review Committee, in collaboration with the SLO Committee developed an annual Program Review update form that tracks progress of implementation and evaluation of SLO work and integration into the planning/function of the discipline. (2.2)

Future work of the SLO Committee includes a review of the data received from the Program review documents submitted in spring 2012. In addition, the committee intends to review the process of mapping course SLOs to degree and certificates and to the Core Competencies. Work related to evaluation of assessments that must be integrated into the planning for each discipline for course, degree, and certificate improvement began in Fall 2012. (2.3)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: DECISION MAKING INCLUDES DIALOGUE ON THE RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT AND IS PURPOSEFULLY DIRECTED TOWARD ALIGNING INSTITUTION-WIDE PRACTICES TO SUPPORT AND IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING.

Standards: I.B; I.B.3; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.f; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation of institutional planning processes and the integration of SLO assessment results with program review, college-wide planning and resource allocation, including evidence of college-wide dialogue.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Student Learning Outcome and assessment data is included in the Instructional Program Review process with updated information on progress toward discipline, program, degree, and certificate planning and implementation. Program Review documents are the basis for evaluation of past progress and future college planning and resource allocation. (see 2.1)

Over the past year, all resource allocation document requests now include the request for evidence demonstrating need based on SLO assessments and analysis. This includes, but is not limited to CTE mini-grant funding and Instructional Equipment requests. (3.1, 3.2) Program Review and included SLO documents were the foundation for the recently updated Educational Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan. (3.3, 3.4)

Two years ago, the college implemented a committee known as Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). This committee reviews data from sectors across the campus to generate dialogue regarding planning for student success and learning. This group is reviewing a model designed to update the integration of planning into all sectors. (3.5)

As noted above, Adjunct Faculty members are now compensated to participate in the SLO development, assessment and documentation cycle. This practice demonstrates the importance the College and the District place on including this body into the planning and resource allocation process.

(See 1.1)

The Program Review Committee has actively worked throughout the 2011 -12 academic year to review and improve the resource allocation process integration into the planning and evaluation cycle. The process is under review by various committees throughout the campus and will be reviewed and finalized in Fall 2012. (See 3.5)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: APPROPRIATE RESOURCES CONTINUE TO BE ALLOCATED AND FINE-TUNED.

Standards: I.B; I.B.4; I.B.6; III.C.2; III.D.2.a; III.D.3.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the integration of SLO assessment results with institutional planning and resource allocation.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

SLO analysis results are required as demonstration for the need to request instructional equipment and other funding from other institutional sources. All request forms now reflect the need to use analyzed data related to SLOs in the discipline, degree or certificate rationale. Examples of committees that now expect to see SLO results as part of the documentation or request process include Curriculum committee, Instructional Equipment Requests (3.2), Program Review Committee, and Career Technical Education grant process. (See 3.1, 3.2)

Program Review documents which include SLO data were extensively used in our recently developed Education Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan. (See 3.3, 3.4)

Dialogue has ensued in Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) to determine how best to measure improvement in student learning outcomes based on the purchase and introduction of instructional equipment or facility improvements. Further dialogue will be needed to determine how best to evaluate the change reflecting the introduction of new equipment. (4.1)

Collaboration between Program Review Committee and Student Learning Outcome Committee resulted in dialogue about a model for integration of planning and evaluation. Dialogue among constituents will continue in Fall 2012 leading to adoption of an updated integrated planning model for the college. (see 3.5)

Through our Teaching and Learning Center, a service for staff education and development, personnel continue to be available to assist faculty in writing SLOs, assessing the student outcomes, and evaluating the effectiveness and need for revision of the SLOs. The database, eLumen, is the tool used by most faculty members to identify, track, and analyze the data to be included in such documents and requests noted above. (4.2)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS EXIST AND ARE COMPLETED AND UPDATED ON A REGULAR BASIS.

Standards: I.A.1; I.B; I.B.3; I.B.5; I.B.6; II.A.2.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the process and cycle of SLO assessment, including results of cycles of assessment. Copies of summative assessment reports, with actual learning outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Student Learning Outcomes data is collected and reported to the campus at Town Hall meetings to foster campus dialogue regularly. This is tracked through the eLumen database and monitored by the Accreditation Liaison Officer. Full time faculty determine the cycle for assessment and evaluation of SLOs for courses, degrees and certificates. Most cycles are either 1 or 2 years. (5.1)

The Program Review process includes a discussion of SLOs results and an analysis of the results. This exercise has lead disciplines and their related courses, degrees, and certificates to review and revise existing SLOs and assessments annually as needed. (See 2.1) The proposal for an annual review is included in the model under discussion related to integration of planning and evaluation. (See 3.5)

Course SLOs are mapped to related degrees and/or certificates, and finally to the institutional core competencies. (See 2.2)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: COURSE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE ALIGNED WITH DEGREE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

Standards: II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the alignment/integration of course level outcomes with program outcomes. Description could include curriculum mapping or other alignment activities. Samples across the curriculum of institutional outcomes mapped to program outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

In the Spring 2012 Flex Day activity, dialogue ensued regarding mapping of courses, degrees and certificates to the institutional Core Competencies. Core Competencies were reviewed for currency, then courses, degrees, and certificates were mapped to the institutional core competencies using actual student transcripts. (See 1.10, 2.2)

With the advent of Adjunct faculty members participating in this process, alignment of courses, certificates, and degree mapping has become a much more campus-wide activity. Adjunct Faculty members work directly with their Full Time faculty counterparts to develop and assess outcomes and document the results in eLumen database. This information is tracked and reviewed monthly by the ALO and reported to the faculty regularly via campus-wide email newsletter titled *Accreditation This*

Week and in monthly Town Hall meetings. (See 1.4 – 1.8, 2.2, and 5.1)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AWARENESS OF GOALS AND PURPOSES OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEY ARE ENROLLED.

Standards: I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on means the college uses to inform students of course and program purposes and outcomes. Samples across the curriculum of: course outlines of record and syllabi with course SLOs; program and institutional SLOs in catalog.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Many faculty place SLOs in their syllabi; however, this is not a contractual requirement. Students are represented on several committees that discuss and make determinations regarding SLOs. Students are represented on other committees where reports are given regarding SLOs. (7.1)

The Student Life web page has a link to the Student Learning Outcome web page designed specifically for students. This page explains what SLOs are, why they are important, how they can help student learning, and the difference between SLOs and final grades. It also has a link to the SLO song and the winning entry in the SLO music video contest. There is also a link to the current list of course level SLOs. (7.2, 7.3)

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:	YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS? WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Las Positas College continues to work across constituencies to integrate the student learning outcomes processes into the campus-wide and district efforts of planning, implementation, and evaluation. Dialogue across our governance structure has incorporated all governance committees into the quest for complete integration of planning and evaluation stemming from the grassroots student learning outcome base for decision-making. Improvements intended are to adopt a new, simplified model that reflects our planning, implementation, and evaluation processes. In addition, a structured campus-wide review of our mission, college-wide goals, and strategic plan began in Fall 2013.

Las Positas College has successfully completed the Awareness and Development levels of the rubric and is at the Proficiency level.

Efforts planned to address needed improvements are as follows:

1. Academic Services will continue to monitor the compliance of completion of Student Learning Outcomes to bring our total of completed from 92% to 100% in the next academic year.

2. Assessment cycles for SLOs will continue to be monitored to ensure that courses are assessed and documented in eLumen as identified by faculty teaching the course.
3. Ensure that the review and revision of the college mission, college-wide goals, and strategic planning process include emphasis on results of assessments from student learning outcomes as analyzed and discussed in program review documents.
4. Through ongoing dialogue, continue to strengthen the linkage between student learning outcomes, program planning and integration into college-wide planning and evaluation for improvement.

TABLE OF EVIDENCE: LIST THE EVIDENCE USED TO SUPPORT YOUR NARRATIVE REPORT, SECTION BY SECTION.

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

1.1 Faculty Association Agreement regarding compensation for Adjunct Faculty.
1.2 Division Meeting Talking Points for February 2012.
1.3 Division Meeting Talking Points for March 2012.
1.4 Report of December 2011 SLO/Assessment data Power Point.
1.5 Report of February 2012 SLO/Assessment data Power Point.
1.6 Report of March 2012 SLO/Assessment data Power Point.
1.7 Summary of Spring progress through April.
1.8 Accreditation This Week campus-wide updates.
1.9 Student Services SAOs.
1.10Flex Day Agenda and Core Competency Discussion Materials.

2.1 Program Review: Addendum and Update 2011-12.
2.2 SLO with Course and Core Competency Information.
2.3 Minutes from Student Learning Outcome Committee, September through February.

3.1 CTE Mini-Grant Application
3.2 Instructional Equipment Request
3.3 Educational Master Plan
3.4 Facilities Master Plan
3.5 Proposed Institutional Effectiveness Model

4.1 Minutes from April or May PBC.
4.2 Teaching materials for SLOs for faculty.

5.1 Sample data sheet compiled from eLumen database.

7.1 Sample Syllabi with Student Learning Outcomes – Math, Intermediate Algebra, Chemistry.
7.2 Student Life Webpage screen shot.
7.3 Student Learning Outcomes webpage.

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

Telephone: 415-506-0234 ◊ FAX: 415-506-0238 ◊ E-mail: accjc@accjc.org

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
STANDARD I The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.			DRAFT		
1A The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.	Incorporate regular review of the mission statement and values statement into the institutional planning cycle.	College Council	Completed		agreed to by College Council
1A4 The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.	Develop an instrument for tracking links between institutional decisions and the college mission.	Director Institutional Research and Exec Staff	In Progress	2012-13 Academic Year	
1B The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.	Train committee chairs on the character and use of dialogue as a tool for continuous improvement of programs and processes.	President's Office/ College Council	In Progress	Academic Year 2013-14	Workshops on Dialogue completed in 2010. Need Discussion in College Council for assessment and development of content
1B1 The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.	Work with committees on the process for communicating committee outcomes and information to campus constituents. Work with campus constituents on communicating needs or concerns through committee representation.	President's Office/ College Council	In Progress	Academic Year 2012 - 13	College Council discussions; guidelines and templates in draft Part. Gov. Handbook

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
1B2 The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.	Develop and update institutional strategic goals.	College Council	In Progress	2012 - 14	Goals developed in 08-09; review/update planned for 2012-14
1B3 The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.	Make updates to the educational master plan systematic, and include in updates an assessment of progress made toward college goals.	College Council and Institutional Effectiveness Committee	In Progress	2013 - 14	EMP process conducted by District in 11-12
1B5 The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.	Create an annual report summarizing assessment data collected and indicating how and where this data is disseminated to the community.	Institutional Effectiveness Committee	In Progress	2013 - 14	IEC and Dir. IRP developed outline for Inst. Eff. Report
1B6 The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.	Conduct an institutional review of the college's major planning and allocation processes, in coordination with program review.	Institutional Effectiveness Committee	In Progress	2012 - 14	Under discussion at IEC; PBC conducting currently
1B7 The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.	Assess the effects of changes made to existing process at the college, on a regular basis.	Institutional Effectiveness Committee	In Progress	2012 - 14	Model in process of development
	Develop and implement a review process for non-instructional units.	Planning and Budget Committee	Completed	2011	NIPR process implemented in 10-11
	Develop an integrated planning model that shows district links to program review and the educational master plan.	In collaboration with District Office, Program Review Committee and College Council	In Progress	2012 - 13	

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
STANDARD II The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that suports learning, enhances student uncerstanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic,and personal development for all of its students.					
2A1a The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.	Improve the orientation and assessment process for increased student success by working with Math and English faculty on consistent validation of assessment cutoff scores.	Math & English with Student Services	In Progress	Ongoing	Ongoing dialogue with counseling and discipline faculty
	Make orientation for new students mandatory.	Student Services	Completed	2011	
2A1b The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.	Discuss and review planning to offer technical support to online students on Saturdays and Sundays since many students take online courses because they work full-time during the week.	Instructional Technology/Open Learning Coordinator, TLC	Completed	2012	Pilot Complete and online tutoring ongoing
2A1c The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.	Identify certificate and major SLOs.	SLO Committee	In Progress	2012 - 2014	
	Assess the alignment of major and certificate SLOs with core competencies.	SLO Committee	In Progress	Ongoing	Staff Dev Committee Flex Day Spring 2012
	Articulate the role of SLOs in college policies, processes, and resource allocation.	Institutional Effectiveness Committee, College Council, Program Review Comm.	In Progress	2012 - 13	Flex Day Activities, Dialogue in relevant Committees

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
2A2b The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.	Identify and query advisory committees to determine if any is inactive.	Dean's Office and Career and Techincal Education Project Manager	Completed	12-May	
	Seek consistent student representation on advisories.		Completed	12-May	
	Monitor the regular posting of advisory committee minutes.		Completed	12-May	
2A2c High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.	Create opportunities for increasing the number and scope of learning communities and interdisciplinary courses.	Basic Skills Committee	In Progress	Ongoing	Puente, Committee funding various courses and programs
2A2e The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.	Develop student learning outcomes for all majors and certificates.	SLO Committee	In Progress		
2A2f The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.	Complete the SLO development for courses, certificates, and majors.	SLO Committee	In Progress		Consistent Review of Progress
	Develop a process for evaluating SLO assessment data for currency and achievement.	SLO Committee	In Progress		Committee Dialogue ongoing
2A2g If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.	Investigate the correlation between outcome achievement and the awarding of credit as SLO data becomes available.	Not feasible but Student Learning Outcome Committee	No Longer Relevant		not feasible
2A2h The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.					

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
2A2i The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.	Develop major and certificate SLOs.	SLO Committee	In Progress		process in place
2A3a An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.	Assess the alignment of GE course SLOs with core competencies, and establish a cyclical process whereby the alignment of GE course SLOs with core competencies is regularly reviewed.	SLO Committee	In Progress		
2A4 All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.	Review a feasible vehicle for tracking student employment following graduation as well as for tracking success rates on licensure/certification exams.	Director of Institutional Research	Completed	Ongoing	done with survey
2A5 Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.					
2B The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.	Assess policies and processes for reviewing student documents and where appropriate create written procedures for consistent actions.	Student Services			
2B1 The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.					

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
2B2 The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following: a. General Information - Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Web Site Address of the Institution: Educational Mission; Course, Program, and Degree Offerings; Academic Calendar and Program Length; Academic Freedom Statement; Available Student Financial Aid; Available Learning Resources; Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty; Names of Governing Board Members. b. Requirements: Admissions; Student Fees and Other Financial Obligations; Degree, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer. c. Major Policies Affecting Students: Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty; Nondiscrimination; Acceptance of Transfer Credits; Grievance and Complaint Procedures; Sexual Harassment; Refund of Fees. d. Locations or Publications Where Other Policies May be Found.	Assess policies and processes for reviewing student documents and where appropriate create written procedures for consistent actions.	Student Services			
2B3c The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.	Identify resources to provide sufficient counseling services.	Student Services	In Progress	Ongoing	Ongoing assessment of needs

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
2B4 The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.	Use SLO data to modify practices, as the data becomes available.	Student Services	In Progress	Ongoing	
	Combine the program review outcomes from Academic Services with those of Student Services to create a more integrated college approach to planning and resource development.	Instructional Program ReviewCommittee	In Progress	2012 - 13	Dialogue in process to integrate Student Services into Program Review Process
	Determine appropriate planning based on Student Services site visit report.	Student Services	In Progress	Ongoing	
2C1a The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.	Plan and develop a library budget that is part of the institutional process that ensures library funds that are stable and consistent which will allow for better planning to meet student and faculty resource needs; ensure student access to resources both on and off campus and provide a suitable physical environment for both student learning and a growing collection.	Cheryl Warren, Marilyn Flores in collaboration with Business Services	In Progress	2012 - 13	
Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.					
2C1b The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.	Begin the college dialogue on Information Competency (IC), and develop a formalized plan that includes both Library-based information competency courses and an interdisciplinary approach.	Library Faculty and Staff	Completed	2011	

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
	Plan and design a dedicated hands-on instructional lab for Library orientations, workshops, and research skills classes.	Library withInformation Technology Department	No Longer Relevant		not feasible
2C1d The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.	Work with Campus Security and Health & Safety Committee to create a plan to address the increasing security and safety needs of Library staff, students and other patrons.	Library with Campus Safety	Completed	2011	
2C1e When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.	Continue to plan and explore remodel ideas in preparation for the future remodel to ensure that an appropriate infrastructure and environment adequately accommodates the needs of library services and staff, student access, and information competency instruction.	Library Faculty and Staff	No Longer Relevant		Due to budgetary issues, project on hold until after November 2012 election
2C2 The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.	Work with the Director of Institutional Research and Planning to develop a survey tool that can be administered on a regular basis to provide more quantifiable data for Library purposes.	Library and Director of Research	Completed	2011	

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
	Collaborate with the Director of Institutional Research and Planning to improve Library questions for the campus wide student / faculty satisfaction surveys.	Library and Director of Research	Completed	Ongoing	
STANDARD III The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieved its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.					
3A1a Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.	Approve the consultative contract faculty hiring procedure for implementation in 2009.	Academic Senate in collaboration with District Human Resources	Completed	2011	Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee
	Provide consistent information and training for the college when hiring processes change.	District Human resources and Administrators	Completed	Ongoing	HR Forums and training for each screening committee
3A1d The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.	Develop and adopt a code of ethics for staff and administration.	Constitutent Groups Representatives	Completed	2011	

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
3A2 The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes.	Assess the impact of growth and changing service demands as outlined in program reviews and the educational master plan in comparison to staffing levels for faculty, staff, and administrators.	Colaboration with District and Las Positas College based on current and future funding	In Progress	Ongoing	Consultant to assist in est. plnng. process; EMP, FMP, DBSG, new LPC plnng. task force
3A3 The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.	Develop and disseminate HR policies and procedures that are clear and accessible to the college on a continued basis. Provide opportunity for college personnel feedback on effectiveness of procedures and forms.	District HR	Completed	Initiated in 2010 and Ongoing	HR Forums and HR website
3A3a The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.					
3A3b The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.					
3A4b The institution regularly assesses that its record in employment equity and diversity is consistent with its mission.	Work with the district on developing a regular assessment of employment equity and diversity in relation to the college mission, and communicate that assessment to the college.	District HR collaboration with faculty, staff and Administrators	In Progress	Ongoing Process	
3A5 The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.	Develop a well-coordinated and appropriately funded staff development program that incorporates faculty, classified, and administration professional development into a centralized program with a centralized location.	Staff Development Committee in collaboration with President	In Progress	Ongoing Process	
3A5a The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.					

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
3A5b With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.	Systematically evaluate staff development committee processes and opportunities, and link staff development to increased program and service effectiveness.	Staff Development Committee	In Progress	Ongoing Process	
3A6 Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.	Ensure that all faculty and staff position needs are identified in respective program reviews and that revisions to the educational master plan include long-term projections for staffing in faculty, staff, and administrator positions. Encourage classified staff participation to this process.	Business Office	Completed	2012	Program Review document and update document
	Develop a long-term projection for staffing in administrative, classified, and faculty positions, in conjunction with budget development.	PBC	Completed	Ongoing	Faculty Hiring Prioritization and Classified/ Admin processes
	Include a process for requesting new administrator positions into the request cycle outlined by the Planning and Budget Committee.	PBC	Completed	May-12	PBC process expanded to include administrators
	Review, revise, and streamline existing policies and procedures related to the District Human Resources office. Work in consultation with the district on review process.	District and Las Positas College work in collaboration	In Progress	Ongoing process	
3B1 The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.	Resolve instances of wheelchair inaccessibility caused by technical difficulties or construction delays.	Business Office	In Progress	Ongoing	ongoing

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
	Install an emergency communication system in each classroom.	Business Office	Completed	Dec-12	Fire Alarm upgrade (Bond); 12/09
3B2 To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.	Provide a collaborative and transparent process for the consideration of what facilities/programs to defer.	Business Services and President collaborate with District Facilities Planning	In Progress	Ongoing Process	
3B2a Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.	Develop a TCO business plan for each new facility to accurately estimate true costs.	Business Services and President collaborate with District Facilities Planning	No Longer Relevant		Currently not Relevant
3B2b Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.	Provide faculty training related to how institutional research is integrated and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation at the college and through that training assist faculty in determining what the data demonstrates.	Facilities Committee and Institutional Research Director in Collaboration with District Faciltities Planning	In Progress	Ongoing Process	
3C1 The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.	Evaluate the need for increased staffing in the college information technology area to accommodate college growth.	Information Technology	Completed	2012	
3C1a Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.					
3C1d The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.	Research and initiate disaster preparedness and recovery procedures.		Completed	2011 by HR	disaster plan and training complete and ongoing for new emp.

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
3D Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.	Establish a transparent process, with documentation, regarding the college's internal technological prioritizations, purchases and requests.	Information Technology	In Progress	2012 - 13	
3D1a Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.	Evaluate the current program review processes of the college to ensure that goals and plans are completely and clearly linked to budgetary needs and planning.	Planning Committee, Program Review Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and College Council	In Progress	Ongoing Process	
3D1d The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.	Ensure that timelines and processes for resource opportunities are consolidated and posted in a central area so all faculty, staff, and students are adequately informed.	PBC	Completed	Continuous Review	PBC website and results of PBC/Pres actions
3D2b Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.	Request increased efforts by district IT to improve user training in Banner software and to provide access to secure areas to more staff with appropriate clearance and accountability.	Information Technology - District		2011	Banner training for admins; ongoing
	Devote district resources to additional user-friendly financial applications.			2011	new financial software
	Increase communication levels between college and district regarding progress reports on changes and enhancements to Banner software.		Completed	2009	ongoing; CTO regularly attends Tech Comm and gives updates

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
3D2c The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.	Ensure that a prudent reserve is established at the college for contingencies and emergencies, and communication between the district and the college should include planning for these contingency funds.	Business Servicesin collaboration with President and District Business Services	In Progress	Ongoing Review	Past budgets; borrow from RUMBL to provide reserves
	Evaluate the district approach to collective bargaining to ensure that business office personnel are included in costing out the short term and long term consequences of negotiated issues.	Las Positas College Business Services in collaboration with District Negotiating Team and Collective Bargaining Units	In Progress	Continuous Review	Negotiating Team meet regularly to discuss issues and resolution
3D2g The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.	Establish a district task force to outline processes and procedures that could achieve improvements. Process mapping and other evaluative work should be utilized to ensure appropriate review of systems.	District Administration working in collaboration with LPC Administration to consistently review fiscal processes	In Progress	Ongoing Review	ongoing; district turnover
	Work with the district in reinstating the Banner Finance (and other) users' group to maximize the software system's capabilities in support of college needs.	Information Technology - District	Completed		Training complete and provided as needed
	Develop a financial management training program for budget managers at the college.	District – Vice Chancellor Business srvices	In Progress	Ongoing	Training complete and provided as needed
3D3 The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.	Establish an evaluation system or scoring process for measuring and communicating performance at reaching goals, evaluating those goals and the strategies used to reach them, and responding to both shortfalls and surpluses in funding.	DBSG in collaboration with LPC Enrollment Management Committee and LPC Business Services	In Progress	Ongoing	

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
STANDARD IV The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.					
4B2b The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following: establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities; ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions; ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.	Work with college processes to integrate evaluation measures through the use of research and dialogue.	President's Office	In Progress	Ongoing	IEC; Dir. Of IRP
	Develop links between completed institutional goals and institutional effectiveness.	Institutional Effectiveness Committee in collaboration with Institutional Research Director	In Progress	Ongoing Process	
4B3 In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.	Review and evaluate annually the District Strategic Plan to determine completed goals and appropriate input, revisions, or improvements. This should be done in collaboration with the district.	Las Positas College College Council and Chancellor's Council	In Progress	Ongoing Annually	
4B3a The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.					

STANDARD	IMPROVEMENT PLAN	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
4B3b The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.	Communicate guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, and evaluate those processes to ensure they are followed. This should be done in collaboration with the district.	District Budget Study Group in collaboration with Planning Task Force/Committee	In Progress	Ongoing Process	DBSG and new LPC Planning Committee
4B3c The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.	Work with the district on a new formula and allocation model for fiscal resources, that more accurately reflects college needs and that can provide for a more transparent budget allocation process.	District Budget Study Group in collaboration with Planning Task Force/Committee	In Progress	2012 - 13	DBSG, Mike Hill, new LPC plnng. task force
4B3g The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.	Use the newly created district delineation of functions map as a foundation for discussion between the college and the district to review primary and secondary roles and to promote improvement of processes related to those roles.	College Council in collaboration with Chancellor's Council	In Progress	Ongoing Process	

Completed
In Progress
No Longer Relevant

Las Positas College
College Council
MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES STATEMENT REVIEW PROCESS

	Action	Timeline	Follow-Up/New Action
1	College Council reviews Mission Statement	Sep-12	date
2	College Council members disseminate mission statement to respective constituencies:	Oct-12	date
	College Council faculty members disseminate to faculty, Academic Senate, SEIU, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Planning and Budget Committee, Program Review, SLO committee, etc.		
	Classified/Confidential College Council members disseminate to classified and confidential employees		
	Administrative College Council members disseminate to LPC Executive Committee		
	Student College Council members disseminate to Associated Students of Las Positas College (ASLPC)		
3	Constituencies asked to provide feedback to College Council by	October 31, 2012	
4	College Council reconvenes to consider any suggested changes	November/December 2012	date
5	If changes occur, mission statement will be redistributed to constituent groups for review	November/December 2012	date
6	College Council votes to recommend mission statement	Jan-13	date
7	Mission statement to Institutional Effectiveness Committee for final review	Feb-13	date
8	Mission statement to Chancellor for review	Feb-13	date
9	Mission statement to CLPCCD Board of Trustees for review and final approval	Mar-13	date
10	Disseminate Mission Statement to all constituencies	Mar-13	date

If changes are recommended at any level, mission statement is returned to the College Council for redistribution to all constituencies.

DRAFT DRAFT

Las Positas College
College Council

DRAFT

COLLEGE WIDE GOALS REVIEW PROCESS

	Action	Timeline	Follow-Up/New Action
1	College Council reviews college-wide goals	Nov-12	date
2	College Council members disseminate college-wide goals to respective constituencies:	Dec-12	date
	College Council faculty members disseminate to faculty, Academic Senate, SEIU, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Planning and Budget Committee, Program Review, SLO committee, etc.		
	Classified/Confidential College Council members disseminate to classified and confidential employees		
	Administrative College Council members disseminate to LPC Executive Committee		
	Student College Council members disseminate to Associated Students of Las Positas College (ASLPC)		
3	Constituencies asked to provide feedback to College Council by	January 31, 2013	
4	College Council reconvenes to consider any suggested changes	February/March 2013	date
5	If changes occur, college-wide goals will be redistributed to constituent groups for review	February/March 2013	date
6	College Council votes to recommend college-wide goals	Mar-13	date
7	College-wide goals to Institutional Effectiveness Committee for final review	Apr-13	date
8	College-wide goals to Chancellor for review	Apr-13	date
9	College-wide goals to CLPCCD Board of Trustees for review and final approval	May-13	date
10	Disseminate college-wide goals to all constituencies	May-13	date

If changes are recommended at any level, college-wide goals are returned to the College Council for redistribution to all constituencies.

Las Positas College
College Council
STRATEGIC PLAN DOCUMENT REVIEW PROCESS

	Action	Timeline	Follow-Up/New Action
1	College Council reviews Strategic Plan Document	Jan-13	date
2	College Council members disseminate strategic plan document to respective constituencies:	Feb-13	date
	College Council faculty members disseminate to faculty, Academic Senate, SEIU, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Planning and Budget Committee, Program Review, SLO committee, etc.		
	Classified/Confidential College Council members disseminate to classified and confidential employees		
	Administrative College Council members disseminate to LPC Executive Committee		
	Student College Council members disseminate to Associated Students of Las Positas College (ASLPC)		
3	Constituencies asked to provide feedback to College Council by	March 31, 2013	
4		April/May 2013	date
5		April/May 2013	date
6	College Council votes to recommend strategic plan document	Aug-13	date
7	Strategic plan document to Institutional Effectiveness Committee for final review	Aug-13	date
8	Strategic plan document to Chancellor for review	Sep-13	date
9	Strategic plan document to CLPCCD Board of Trustees for review and final approval	Oct-13	date
10	Disseminate strategic plan document to all constituencies	Nov-13	date

If changes are recommended at any level, strategic plan document is returned to the College Council for redistribution to all constituencies.

LPC PLANNING TASK FORCE
Proposed Charge

Reporting Relationship: College Council

Charge:

- Present recommendations to college council in regard to closing the gap in the planning and allocation process. (Relates to accreditation).
- Recommend prioritization of the College's educational outcomes.
- Serve as liaison between the Las Positas College Council and DBSG with regard to aligning college goals as outlined in the College's Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Values Statement and Strategic Plan with the mission of CLPCCD.

Membership of this task force will include:

A. College executive staff (president and vice presidents);
B. Director of Research and Planning
C. All LPC members of DBSG
D. Chair of Program Review
E. Chair of Enrollment Management
F. One member of counseling faculty
G. One rep from CCN (Campus Change Network)
H. One student representative
I. Others as recommended by College Council

Membership is intended to include representatives of all campus constituencies. This includes faculty and staff within Student Services, Academic Services and Administrative Services. Each division and program (e.g., CTE, Transfer, Basic Skills, Student Government) shall be represented by the membership of the Task Force. ***Meetings will be widely publicized and open to the entire campus community.***

Goal:
To develop a campus-wide understanding of institutional