

EVALUATION REPORT

LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE

4901 E. Carson St.
Long Beach, CA 90808

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Long Beach City College from October 13 – 16, 2008

Thomas A. Crow, Ph.D.
Chair

LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE

Team Roster

October 13 – 16, 2008

Dr. Thomas Crow (Chair)
Chancellor
State Center Community College District

Mr. Anthony Cantu (Team Assistant)
Vice President, Instruction
Fresno City College

Dr. Baba Adam
Director of Institutional Research
Butte College

Ms. Margaret Mayfield
Head Faculty Librarian
Hartnell College

Dr. David Bezayiff
Professor, History
Porterville College

Mr. Steven Reynolds
English Instructor/Interim Dean
College of the Siskiyous

Dr. Kristin Bruno
Dean, Instructional Services
Glendale Community College

Mr. Scott Thomason
Vice President, Administrative Services
Reedley College

Dr. Marcia Corcoran
Dean, Language Arts
Chabot College

Dr. Karolyn van Putten
Psychology Professor
Laney College

Ms. Melinda Matsuda
Vice President of Student Services
Chabot College

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE

Comprehensive Evaluation Visit
October 13-16, 2008

INTRODUCTION

Long Beach City College recently celebrated its 80th anniversary. It was founded in 1927 as part of the Long Beach Unified School District. The college separated from the school district in 1970, creating the Long Beach Community College District. The district today is a single-college district with two principal sites: the Liberal Arts Campus and the Pacific Coast Campus.

The college student body represents the rich diversity of the surrounding area. Thirty-six percent of the students are Latino, twenty-six percent white, seventeen percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and thirteen percent African American. Long Beach City College is a large urban college with an unduplicated headcount enrollment in fall 2007 of 29,000, and a corresponding full-time

2008 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the 2002 self study report, reviewing the evidence, conducting a college visitation, and the fact that Recommendation 2 of the 2002 accreditation recommendations has only been partially addressed, the team developed eleven college recommendations.

8. The team recommends that the college evaluate the role of collegewide leadership in institutional governance and use that evaluation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of organizational processes, practices, and decision-making (IVA1, IVA2, IVA3, IVA4, IVA5).
9. The team recommends that the college continue to encourage participation by all constituent groups in the college governance process (IVB2b).

COMMENDATIONS

1. The team commends the college for the respect and support it has earned in the community, as evidenced by the passage of two general obligation bonds for the improvement of facilities.
2. The team commends the college on the welcoming environment and sense of purpose demonstrated by students and employees.
3. The team commends the college on the commitment to increasing opportunities for students at the Pacific Coast Campus (PCC) through improved facilities, services, and course offerings.
4. The team commends the college on its leadership with the Long Beach College Promise, a partnership with Long Beach Unified School District and California State University, Long Beach, to improve college access for high school graduates. The team further commends the Long Beach City College Foundation for raising \$6 million to pay for one semester of college for all graduates from the Long Beach Unified School District.
5. The team commends the college on its Student Success Plan which integrates instructional and support services and demonstrates the college's continued commitment to student access, equity, and success of all students regardless of ability.

Team Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2002 Recommendations

Recommendation 1:

Whatever the current issues or state of labor affairs at a college, full and consistent participation in the self study and accreditation process is critical to the integrity and validity of the process. Long Beach City College should preserve its re2mmt

employees. Interviews with classified leadership indicate a better relationship with the administration. The classified staff feels more valued and understands the importance of participating in the accreditation process. Overall, it appears that the “buy in” to the accreditation process is improving. The college has partially met this recommendation.

Recommendation 2:

In order to strengthen the college’s efforts in the area of institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college move forward in assessing student learning outcomes in instructional, student services, and information resources areas. In support of this, the college needs to resolve the issues regarding the Coordinator of Student Learning Outcomes position quickly (3A3, 3A4, 3B2, 3C1, 3C2, 4B3-6, 4D2-3, 6.7).

As noted in the previous accreditation report, the college was a reluctant participant in the SLO process. The college proposed a completion date of 2020, which is completely unacceptable by accreditation standards. Dr. Barbara Beno met with various constituent groups at the college to inform them of the consequences of not having all aspects of student learning outcomes completed by 2012. At the time of the visitation, there was limited completion of SLOs, and almost no assessment. The “buy in” is improving, although it has not been totally embraced by all faculty. The Coordinator of Student Learning Outcomes position was approved as a 60 percent position in 2003, but was not filled until 2005. The college has partially met the intention of the recommendation.

Recommendation 3:

The team recommends that the college conduct an actuarial study of retiree medical benefits and consider setting a reserve for the cost of these benefits (9A2, 9C1, 9C3).

The college has received two actuarial studies since the last accreditation visit. The college has begun funding this liability and has established an irrevocable trust managed by Futuris Public Entity Investment Consortium. The college meets the recommendation.

Recommendation 4:

The team recommended that the college immediately review, clarify, improve, and document its accounting practices, processes, and procedures to ensure conformity with good accounting practices (9A4, 9B6).

The college has made significant progress and received unqualified certified annual audits. The college followed up on audit findings and made the necessary procedural changes. The fiscal operations department has been reorganized. The college has satisfactorily addressed the recommendation.

Recommendation 5:

The team observed a pervasive institutional climate permeated by suspicion and mutual distrust by leaders of all employee constituent groups. To ensure that the climate does not further erode and undermine powerful college-wide initiatives, the team recommended that all groups at Long Beach City College immediately find and use internal and external resources and processes to reestablish the spirit of collaboration and collegiality (10B5, 10B8, 10B9).

The college is making strides in improving the level of trust and mutual respect among all constituent groups. Administrative training on problem solving has been conducted. The college has developed a new Staff Planning Committee, a revitalized Classified Employees Recognition Week, and a new Classified Staff Development Day. Also, there is a new Professional Development Committee with a website, and a Staff Diversity Initiative. The college is working hard to address the recommendations and is making progress, but efforts will have to continue to develop an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust. The college has partially met this recommendation.

ACCREDITATION THEMES

1. Dialogue

ACCJC accreditation requirements emphasize that an “institution-wide dialogue must be at the heart of the self-evaluation process,” and that the processes that promote communication should be “inclusive, informed, and intentional” in order to continuously improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning on the campus (IB1, IB2, IB4). The last accreditation underscored the importance of dialogue to “reestablish the spirit of collaboration and collegiality,” and Long Beach City College (LBCC), through numerous venues of committees, work groups, forums, informal meetings, and planning and governance bodies, has made an effort to willingly support the central core values of this theme. Some outgrowths of these forums and committees have been campus dialogues that focused on issues such as student success (Equity for All Project, the Missing 87, Deming Report, and the Task Force of College Readiness and Student Success) (IIB5). However, there are indications that a “deeper” dialogue is still needed in order to build “a spirit of trust on the campus.”

LBCC has been candid about past issues related to establishing a positive climate of dialogue on the campus. It appears, however, that LBCC has now made a strong commitment to promote internal and external dialogue that is open, collegial, ongoing, and purposeful, in order that the institution can enhance excellence in teaching and learning and document learning outcomes (IIA1a). Furthermore, the entire college community, student body, administration, faculty, and staff, should continue to engage in, and continue to recognize the importance of dialogue for the well-being of the institution (IA, IVA1, IVA2a, IVA3).

2. Student Learning Outcomes

The essential theme of an institution should be that its teaching is effective “at the course, program, and degree level” (IA). This theme requires that above all else, the institution can demonstrate that it is engaging “in self-analysis leading to improvement of all that it does regarding learning and teaching.” In sum, it should be able to demonstrate through assessment its efforts to produce SLOs in both instruction and student support services (IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2b, IIA2c). The institution has been taking steps to emphasize the importance of SLOs by encouraging all departments to focus on SLOs, an Assessment Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) committee was established, as well as a Student Success Plan. In addition, the college brought in a nationally recognized expert on critical thinking to assist faculty interested in refining their exams to promote student learning outcomes. The Academic Senate approved a Study Skills Task Force to promote SLOs in conjunction with a Title 5 grant. Some LBCC faculty have also attended workshops and conferences sponsored by the State Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. To provide an integrative approach to implement SLOs, the ASLO committee established 11 core competencies. However, attention has mostly been given to only the first core competency, critical thinking, and the campus needs to aggressively work to develop the other ten. Despite the efforts to initiate and implement SLOs, the institution still faces serious challenges. It must develop a clearer plan to not only balance curriculum offerings at both LBCC and PCC sites, but it must also make certain SLOs at both sites are moving forward simultaneously. Moreover, the college also has a great deal more to do at the departmental level, where there is a distinct dissonance between faculty members who are actively engaged in incorporating SLOs into their syllabi, and those who are not willing, or are reluctant to do so. The college must also develop a method to achieve an effective alignment between Instruction and Student Services at both the LBCC and PCC sites. Through its several campus committees and subcommittees, Curriculum, Planning, Educational Master Plan, and ASLO, the several dialogues that have taken place need to be moved to another level, meaning that the importance of the objectives of this theme, move from continued dialogue to substantial implementation throughout the college (IIA2f, IIA2g, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIC1b, IVA1).

3. Institutional Commitments

The Governing Board has approved and adopted a mission statement for LBCC that underscores the college’s commitment to providing high quality opportunities for student learning to a diverse student population (IA, IA1, IA3, IA4). The primary goal of the college is to effectively incorporate the underlying values of this mission statement into its planning and development. In addition, a “vision statement for 2020” and the “core competencies” are intended to be viewed as integral parts of the mission statement too. Moreover, the college is exploring ways to better publicize and inform its service community about its mission Statement. Attention has also been given to ensuring that college publications, schedule of classes, catalog, websites, and physical signs denoting the mission statement, are consistent and accurate. The college continues to wrestle with being able to better connect the mission statement to institutional effectiveness within its internal audiences of administrators, faculty, and staff. Within the campus organization are “dissidents,” whose voices “are not given ample access.” The problem is further compounded because the “majority of administrative officers and faculty leaders are on one campus.” Finding ways to improve communication, and build a sense that there is “inclusion” in the areas of

that the college strengthen its efforts in institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes. There has been a concerted effort on behalf of the college to meet this recommendation through the establishment of committees specifically intended to address them, such as the ASLO. The college has developed an EMP which was intended to meet both present and future student needs through an ongoing process of dialogue and systematic change. The institution has adequate staff and is moving towards increased collaboration and collegiality in addressing the implementation of SLOs, facilities and fiscal planning, and fulfilling the stated mission of the college (IA, IB, IB1, IB4, IB5). Still, it is apparent that the organization must do much more to ensure that the themes are integrated and supported across the institution, and that both campus sites genuinely believe they are one organization (IVA, IVA1).

Eligibility Requirements

1. AUTHORITY

The visiting team validated that Long Beach City College is authorized to operate as an educational institution and to award degrees under regulations of the California State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges. It is accredited by the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. MISSION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College's mission is clearly defined and appropriate for an institution of higher learning and the students it serves. The college's mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on March 6, 2006, and is published in its catalog and webpage.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College is governed by a publicly elected five member independent policy-making Board of Trustees that is responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the college. The board ensures that the mission of the institution is fulfilled. impact (cr.0051)

6. OPERATIONAL STATUS

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach

13. FACULTY

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has 283 full-time faculty and 747 part-time faculty (fall 2007). Faculty are qualified and have the necessary experience to support all of the college's educational programs. A statement of faculty responsibilities exists in faculty contracts and the faculty handbook.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College provides a full complement of student support services that support student learning and development. These services are consistent with its mission and the students the college serves.

15. ADMISSION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission and comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 5.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College provides specific long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and all its educational programs and services.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness and to assure financial stability.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College has established an institutional planning and evaluation process for the development of the college. It has not fully implemented a process for the assessment of student learning outcomes to measure student achievement of educational goals. The college has begun a process that integrates planning and resources allocation. However, the college needs to systematically evaluate all of its planning processes.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College publishes in its catalog, web site, and other sources current information that describes its purpose and objectives, admission requirements and procedures, fees, rules and regulations directly affecting students, degree and certificate requirements, and other information pertinent to students.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The visiting team confirmed that Long Beach City College adheres to the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards and policies of the Commission. It describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.

Standard I

Mission and Institutional Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Comments

The college's broad educational programs and offerings are aligned with its purposes, character, and student population. (IA). The college has continued to promote dialogue and foster discussions throughout the college community regarding the ongoing relevance of the mission statement to student learning and student learning outcomes. The self study report also demonstrated that the college annually reviews vocational course offerings and programs to ensure they too are in alignment with local needs (IA1).

The mission statement of the college has been approved by its Board of Trustees and is published in appropriate and accessible media, college catalog, and the LBCC website (IA2).

LBCC has a formal process for reviewing the mission statement that is linked to the master plan development cycle, a cycle that occurs every three to five years. However, the college allows for the revision of the mission statement in the event the college undertakes to implement new educational programs that need to be included as part of the mission statement. The current mission statement was last reviewed in revised in March 2006 (IA3).

The self study demonstrated that the college mission statement is a central element to assist the college in its planning and decision-making processes (IA4).

Findings and Evidence

Both the self study report and the college catalog provided evidence that the college has established and implemented programs and services aligned with its purposes, character, and its

student population (IA1). The minutes of the March 6, 2006 meeting of the Board of Trustees

Several college faculty and staff have attended various professional development and training activities related to institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

After the retirement of the dean of institutional research and dean of planning in 2008, the college created an Office of Institutional Effectiveness, which is staffed with an associate dean, four research analysts and one planning analyst. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has a data warehouse and has produced several reports.

Findings and Evidence

Based on campus interviews of the executive vice president of academic affairs, the coordinators of student learning outcomes assessment, curriculum committee chairs, the associate dean of institutional effectiveness and the faculty senate president and reviewing the available evidence, the college has yet to fully comply with the ACCJC's institutional effectiveness standards.

Reviewing evidence the college provided and interviews with college faculty and staff members confirm that the college has a high degree of institutional dialogue about student learning and

education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

STANDARD II
Student Learning Programs and Services

A.

IIA6c). The accuracy of this info

who have volunteered provided reports of their work resulting from their participation in the Learning Outcomes Summer Institute, 2008. Still, interviews with members of the ASLO subcommittee reveal that there is an ongoing struggle to define what a program is. In not defining what a program is, faculty are not able to determine exactly what the learning outcomes should be. Consequently, the college is not assessing student achievement of its programs' learning outcomes, student achievement of learning outcomes is not directly tied to program review, nor is student achievement of learning outcomes tied to program planning and resource allocation, and student achievement of learning outcomes is not directly tied to the granting of degrees and certificates (IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2c, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2i).

Evidence that there is a lack of forward progr

that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs

offer a program of clubs and activities. The associated student body president, with her motto, “school spirit means student involvement,” has held forums to encourage students to become engaged with student life, including standing committees (IIB3b).

Comprehensive counseling and/or advising services are offered to students at various program locations including PCC and online. Professional development for counseling faculty is provided through in-service training and regular staff meetings both on campus and through various regional and state-sponsored conferences and workshops. Although evaluation does not fully incorporate the assessment of SLOs at this time, program reviews, student satisfaction surveys, and workgroup and task force-directed investigations of particular aspects of counseling have implications for supporting student success (IIB3c).

LBCC has a student services staff that reflects the diversity of its student population and provides professional role models at all levels, programs, practices, and services across the college, which supports and enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The evidence to support this can be found in various initiatives including the associated student body cultural affairs council, a diverse array of student clubs, events, activities, and special programs and services addressing the unique and special needs of targeted student groups (IIB3d).

As with other California Community Colleges, LBCC’s open enrollment policy does not require admissions instruments except for the administration of the Ability to Benefit instrument as appropriate. The college participates in the statewide approval and validation of its various assessment instruments utilized for placement, incorporated with multiple measures, incorporated in counseling sessions for placement recommendations (IIB3e).

The area of permanent, secure confidential student records is solid, with board policies and regulations and procedures emphasizing student confidentiality in all programs and services. The Confidentiality of Student Records and Information Policy is strictly adhered to through a Confidentiality/Security Agreement. The dean of admissions and records regularly conducts FERPA workshops and the agreement is part of all full-time and part-time hiring packets for faculty and staff (IIB3f).

The college has utilized three LBCC student perception surveys including a Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, the LBCC Graduation Satisfaction Survey, and the NASPA Student Profile Survey. More recently, the previous comprehensive counseling and student services program review utilizes various assessment measures, and although they may not incorporate student learning outcomes, there are immediate upcoming plans to fully meet this standard (IIB4).

Findings and Evidence

Two areas of the LBCC catalog require revisions: the academic freedom statement and clarification of the acceptance of transfer credit. This needs to be the language outlined in Board Policy and Administrative Regulations 4019 (IIB2).

There is evidence in the comprehensive program review for student support services (2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007) to address issues aligned with collegewide goals and their status

students. A new library and learning resource center recently opened at the Pacific Coast Campus (PCC), and the remodeling of the Liberal Arts Campus library (LAC) is scheduled to be completed soon. New state-of-the-art libraries and labs providing improved study space, more computers, and access to the library's complete collection will enhance students' learning opportunities at LBCC. One weakness is funding for the library's print collections. Over time

study to research current classified and management position duties and responsibilities were implemented July 1, 2008.

Findings and Evidence

The college determines qualifications of faculty through the rationale of a hiring priorities committee, written administrative regulations, and established procedures to review applicant paperwork from human resources. A review of faculty qualifications verified faculty all meet minimum qualifications. Foreign transcripts are evaluated by the National Association of Credentials Evaluations Service (NACES), listing twelve organizations with which potential candidates may submit transcripts directly (IIA1a).

A two-year reclassification study of staff and managers, based on work from the consultant, Rewards Strategy Group, was implemented in July 2008 to ensure position duties and responsibilities are current, with over 20 percent modifications in duties and 50 percent changes in salary.

A plan for the review and alignment of administrative regulations with current practice regarding academic administrative hiring is promised by 2011.

Standard evaluation procedures are in place per the collective bargaining agreements and are conducted annually. Ratings of “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” are accompanied by facts and suggestions for improvement (IIIA1b). The classified evaluation timeline has been shifted in the new contract to improve timeliness of reporting and improved ability for addressing grievances, though grievances have declined since 2006 when new manager training on evaluation processes has been offered annually. An updated 2005 management performance evaluation lists three criteria related to student learning outcomes, though administrative regulation 3007 do not yet reflect this update. For the contributions of staff and tutors toward student learning outcomes, criteria related to student learning outcomes is not explicit.

Criteria related to effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes are not explicit in full-time or part-time faculty evaluations; in fact, none of the professional standards mention student learning. Several town hall meetings have offered opportunities for dialogue around the topic of incorporating student learning outcomes assessment into the faculty evaluation procedure but it is “a work in progress” and many are reticent about incorporating student learning outcomes into individual evaluations. Pockets of faculty have written course-level outcomes. In the fall of 2007, the student learning outcome coordinator met with department heads, but participation of faculty is “voluntary” and there is no tracking of faculty involvement. Discussions about assessment tools have occurred in some areas. The summer institute debated if the core competency of critical thinking could be measured from a multiple choice format, but it is not systematic. The team did not find data on student learning, discussions about how to improve student learning, or changes resulting from analyses of student learning (IIIA1c).

Codes of ethics exist for some constituent groups and are in writing. The Board of Trustees reviewed and revised its existing code of ethics and conduct policy, implementation of the policy, and process to deal with violation of this code was effective August 2008. The self study

notes plans to develop one collegewide code of ethics and the development of a board policy for dealing with behavior that violates the code of ethics (IIIA1d).

The number of full-time faculty exceeds the Chancellor's Office Full-Time Faculty Obligation, a guideline the college currently uses for what determines a sufficient number of full-time faculty. A new reorganization request requires various levels of approvals for new classified staff. A new realignment/reorganization plan, which is expected to be approved in November 2008, shows sufficient number of management (IIIA2).

Personnel policies ensuring fairness in employment procedures are established and posted. Written regulations allow employees access to records and maintain the confidentiality of employee records. A security breach in April 2008 resulted in training for managers on security awareness and in training for all employees on identity theft (IIIA3).

The college collects data to compare the ethnic diversity of employees with the ethnic diversity of the community (IIIA4b). Copies of Board Policies on Affirmative Action, Unlawful Discrimination, and Sexual Harassment are distributed to all new employees.

In February 2008, the Academic Senate passed motions to encourage the development of programs and hiring practices that foster diversity and to revise hiring processes to ensure the advancement of diversity among faculty. Screening committees for regular contract faculty are diverse, when possible, and include a non-voting equal opportunity member to ensure a committee's adherence to equal opportunity laws. A Staff Equity Plan was developed in March 2008 and a staff equity committee, in collaboration with human resources and the Academic Senate, will implement the plan. The plan includes strategies for addressing the need to create a faculty population more representative of the community the college serves, including dialogue, hiring, and policies. Policies for fairness in hiring for part-time faculty will be undergoing review to ensure equal opportunity compliance (IIIA4).

Training activities are evident for learning styles, disability, college resources, SafeZone, team building, communication, and retention, and the college is sending teams to local diversity conferences. The college participated in Equity for All and the California Benchmarking project through the Center for Urban Education and developed new initiatives targeting minority and low-income students (IIIA4, IIIA4c, IIIA5).

The faculty development committee is responsible for planning, implementation, and evaluation of on-campus professional development. It oversees new faculty orientations and mentoring as well as approvals for conference attendance. Sessions are evaluated, and the committee uses results to plan future activities.

Human Resources hired a new staff development coordinator in December 2007, and initiated additional training opportunities (Professional Development Program) in order to organize more systematic professional development for classified and management. An assessment survey in August 2007 summarized 448 responses of professional development needs, and results were used to guide planning for future activities. Collegewide learning goals and the president's 18-Month Agenda also provided input regarding priorities for professional development.

Administrators, faculty, and sta

Plans are in place for the college to move forward on the issues identified in this standard: developing an institution wide code of ethics, reviewing discrepancies in hiring practices from written regulations, examining the sufficiency of funding for off-campus faculty professional development. The college now needs to move forward on these plans.

A range of professional development opportunities are provided, but their integration with institutional planning is inconsistent.

Contributions to student learning outcomes and assessment are included explicitly in management evaluations. Faculty and others responsible for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes do not have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those outcomes (IIIA1c).

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to comp

Regular updates of critical path timelines, cost estimates, cash flow projections, and other reports encompassing all aspects of each project are provided to the college and the board of trustees.

Findings and Evidence

The Safety Committee has members representing all constituent groups and meets monthly. Annual safety inspections are performed by independent consultants. These independent consultants also provide specialized training to college staff on safety as well as appropriate operation of equipment (IIIB1a).

College staff are participating in the Disaster Resistant California Community College NIMS and SEMS training administered by the State Chancellor's Office (IIIB1a).

The college centers facilities are furnished and equipped comparably to those one the main campus (IIIB1b).

Through the program review process, the safety committee, and the facilities advisory committee employees are able to identify facility and equipment needs for their areas. Needs for modification of the college's facilities necessary to provide safe and secure physical environment for its students, employees, and community members are also identified. The college has employed consultants to create its Facilities Master Plan, which is integrated with program review and the educational program plans (IIIB1b, IIIB2, IIIB2b).

Conclusions

LBCC meets the standards of physical resources.

Recommendations

None

C. Technology Resources

General Observations

In general, LBCC is to be commended for its technology infrastructure. It has two departments for managing a large amount of technology. An extensive list of supported hardware, software, and telecommunications is listed in the appendices of the Technology Master Plan 2006-2011.

First, LBCC has the Academic Computing and Information Technology (ACIT) department, residing in administrative services, which is divided into three sections: application support and development, network services and technical support, and academic computing and multimedia services. This is a standard organizational structure for an IT organization, and it manages a wide variety of hardware and software. In addition, LBCC has implemented PeopleSoft in the past five years, and a "Responsible Managers User Group" has been implemented.

The ability of ACIT to be effective is limited by staffing. The staffing has not been commensurately increased as the amount of hardware and software has grown exponentially since 2002. Although a satisfaction survey of the college community shows great appreciation for the ACIT staff, there is a general feeling of dissatisfaction with its level of performance (ACIT Program Review 2007), due to staffing constraints.

The second organization is the Instructional Technology and Distance Learning (ITDC) department, residing in academic affairs, which operates a Faculty Resource Center. Again, staffing is the major constraint on the department's ability to deliver quality service. LBCC's ITDC is to be commended for implementing a team approach to development of online courses in which the faculty member, as the content expert, works with the technical staff to produce the class. An internally developed online learning environment, ezLearn or the e-learning zone, has been quite successful. However, it is not fully linked to PeopleSoft, and it may be difficult to support with expected growth in the future.

It is clear that LBCC is struggling like most colleges with the cost of technology and also how to integrate it into the planning process. While the college is to be commended for writing and approving a Technology Master Plan 2006-2011 and a Distance Learning Plan, the goal of ensuring that planning drives technology purchasing decisions is not yet fully realized. For example, "Technology planning at LBCC has been increasingly integrated into institutional planning since the late 1990's," Standard III C2, p. 268; "For the last several years without a systematic approach LBCC has pieced together available resources, in many cases through categorical funding sources, to sustain and manage this growth," Standard III C1d, p. 267; and "Although the current program review process identifies specific technology needs, there is no formal or systematic means of communicating these needs to ACIT," Standard III C2, p. 269).

LBCC has recently set aside a substantial amount of technology funding which is clearly a commitment to the importance of technology (\$1.4 million in 2006-7, \$536,986 in 2007-8, and \$1 million in 2008-9). However, this type of year by year funding, mostly used to replace outdated equipment, while important, does not move the college in a strategic direction to use technology to support teaching, learning, and the college's administrative functions.

Findings and Evidence

LBCC is doing a very good job of using the staffing and equipment resources it has to support teaching, learning, and administrative staff. Further, it is clear that there is a new emphasis on the technology needs of the campus (Goal 2 of the "Board of Trustees' Goals for 2007-2009" and the President's "18 Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success and Community Development January 2007-June 2008.") To this end, LBCC has committed significant resources to technology in the past three budgets (\$1.4 million in 2006-7, \$536,986 in 2007-8, and \$1 million in 2008-9). The appendices of the Technology Master Plan 2006-2011 outline how this funding is being used to upgrade equipment.

However, it is stated in Standard III C1d, "For the last several years without a systematic approach, LBCC has pieced together available resources, in many cases through categorical

funding sources, to sustain and manage this growth,” and verified in the Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes, September 18, 2008, “Other Financing Sources—From Capital Projects Fund—increase of \$1,000,000 to continue with the Technology efforts; the funding became available from the capitalized interest account that existed for the COPS; since the COPS has been paid in full, these funds are available for capital outlay purposes.” While this commitment to technology resources is to be commended, a secure, ongoing source of technology funding could not be verified.

Conclusions

There is much to commend in LBCC’s technology progress, including the planning (as evidenced in the Board of Trustees’ Goals for 2007-2009, the President’s 18 Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success and Community Development January 2007-June 2008, and the Technology Master Plan 2006-2011) and the funding commitment in the budgets of 2006-7, 2007-8 and 2008-9. However, the challenge will be to develop an ongoing source of technology funding to realize the benefits of the extensive technology planning.

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).
7. The team recommends that the college commit to technology funding which is responsive to college planning (IIIC1c, IIIC2).

D. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

General Comments

The college monitors student enrollments and develops its annual budget with the intention of maintaining a budget that balances revenues and expenditures. The Budget for FY 2008-2009 was developed utilizing the Board of Trustee Goals for 2007-2009.

Financial status reports are provided to the Board of Trustees monthly and fiscal projections are also provided quarterly using the Quarterly CCSF 311 reports. The college regularly performs both short term as well as longer term projections of its financial position.

College staff monitor the financial position of the college as well as the financial position of the State of California on an ongoing basis. Staff participate

assignment of faculty, course offerings, student support services, and facilities. Having explored the possibility of creating a two-college district and having come to the conclusion that there were valid reasons why such a change would be ill advised, the college considers the PCC an educational center and it has made significant strides toward upgrading all of its aspects.

Findings and Evidence

Regulations and policies exist (Board Policy 2006 and Administrative Regulations 2006.6) that specify and describe the “roles and involvement of each constituent group involved in the participatory governance structure (LBCC Self Study, p. 294).” It appears that, in principle, there are six primary governance bodies, the Board of Trustees, the President’s Leadership Council, the College Planning Committee, the Academic Senate, the Classified Union, and the Associated Student Body. These six are supplemented by at least four more that are also advisory to the President.

The newly restructured College Planning Committee (LBCC Self-Study, p. 294) was approved in August 2007. It is composed of: 1) all members of the Superintendent-President’s Executive Committee, excluding the Superintendent-President, 2) the Academic Senate Executive Committee, 3) a representative from the department heads, elected by them, 4) a representative from the instructional deans, 5) a representative from the student services deans, 6) nine representatives from, respectively, the ASB (Associated Student Body), Community College Association (CCA), Certificated Hourly Instructors (CHI), and American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

Although “mechanisms and protocols have been established to provide constituents with an opportunity for input into the institutional decision-making process” (LBCC Self Study, p. 295), the institution has not yet conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of these policies, protocols and processes, nor is there evidence of a plan for when or how that will occur.

Conclusions

8. The team recommends that the college evaluate the role of collegewide leadership in institutional governance and use that evaluation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of organizational processes, practices, and decision-making (IVA1, IVA2, IVA3, IVA4, IVA5).

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Comments

LBCC is governed by a five-member elected Board of Trustees. The board meets its legal responsibilities of duly notifying the public of meetings, agendas, and minutes. At the meetings, there are ample opportunities for the public to offer input. Annual goals are developed, which guide the operations of the district.

The superintendent/president was selected utilizing a process that included constituent groups and the community. The board delegates the operation of the district to the superintendent/president (IVBj).

The district is presently undergoing a process to revise many out of date policies and administrative regulations. Among the revisions are sections on the selection of the superintendent/president and the penalty to board members violating their code of ethics (IVBb, IVBh).

The board conducts annual self evaluations, which lead to the formation of their annual goals. By contract, the superintendent/president is also evaluated annually (IVBg, IVBj).

The superintendent/president is implementing new processes and committees to ensure avenues of communication throughout the college. It will be important for the constituent groups to “re-engage” in the college governance responsibility. There is work to be done in planning and resource allocation, as well as the accreditation process (IVB2a, IVB2b).

Findings and Evidence

The board has a manual of board policies and administrative regulations that guide the district in its operations. However, many sections are very dated. There is no policy or practice to review the policies on a regular basis. Proposed board policy changes are vetted by constituent groups, after which the superintendent/president recommends changes to the board. Since the self study, the college has formed a committee to review the policies. The committee is active and reviews critical sections first, and has revised several policies to date. The college also contracts with the Community College League of California for the policy services (IVBb).

The trustees participate in a formalized annual self-evaluation process (IVBg). From this evaluation, board goals for the next year are formulated. The goals are vetted among all constituent groups. From these goals, the college units set their goals and develop budget

priorities. It appears to be working quite well, and formalizes the board's leadership over the direction of the college. The major goals for the past year were "Measure and Improve Student Success" and "Measure and Improve Fiscal and Infrastructure Stability."

In April 2003, the board adopted a Code of Ethics and Conduct (IVBh). The code does not define actions that can be taken if a board member violates the code of ethics. The Code of Ethics and Conduct includes language on conflict of interest. The committee on board policy revisions is addressing the issue of violation of the code of ethics.

In 2007, a new superintendent/president was hired. There was a screening committee that included representatives from all of the constituency groups and the committee. There is, however, no policy that defines the search process for the hiring of the superintendent/president. This area is also being addressed by the committee rewriting the board policies. The superintendent/president is formally evaluated by the board on an annual basis.

The Board of Trustees has policies in place that define the governance of the district, including participatory governance. The board conducts its business within the framework of law and policies. There are numerous opportunities for the public to provide input at all meetings.

The board meets the requirements of posting the publicizing policies, meeting notices, agendas, and minutes. Information regarding the district, trustees, and trustee areas are also posted on the web site. Additionally, board meetings are videotaped. The board actively participates in board development activities and professional development. Several members hold or have held leadership positions in state and national trustee organizations. New member orientation is conducted on an informal basis. New trustees are paired with senior administrators to learn about the district. New members are encouraged to attend the workshop for new trustees sponsored by the Community College League of California. Additional information is provided at workshops, study sessions, and retreats.

Trustees are updated on the accreditation process in several ways. The accreditation liaison officer and superintendent/president make formal presentations and send periodic progress reports to the board. A board member is designated as the liaison to the process.

As noted in the previous accreditation report, the lack of collegial relationships has been a major stumbling block to addressing critical issues at the college. Committees have been restructured, the planning processes have changed, and some progress in collegiality is noted. The new superintendent/president is providing more avenues for input, and is welcoming constituent input.

The superintendent/president published an 18-Month Agenda in 2007 to guide the direction of the college. A 12-Month Agenda

Regarding institutional research, the board and superintendent/president receive an institutional effectiveness report, and the superintendent/president receives an annual staff diversity report.

In response to a previous accreditation recommendation, reassigned time was allocated for a coordinator of student learning outcomes. The approval was made in 2003, but the position was not filled until 2005.

The linkage between department planning and resource allocation continues to develop.

The new superintendent/president halted the previous planning processes. A new planning process was approved in 2007, but the college needs to better communicate the process to all constituents and develop an evaluation process.

The college struggled with enrollment for the past few years. They were on stabilization funding from the Chancellor's Office for two years, but have shown a positive increase in their reserves for the past two years.

As an aside, the entire section on governance in the self study seemed to pit the current practices against the previous administration for reasons that are unclear.

Recommendations

2. The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA, IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).
5. The team recommends that the college develop a college-wide code of ethics for use by