

**Accreditation Focused Midterm Report**  
**October 15, 2011**

Submitted by:

Los Medanos College  
Contra Costa Community College District  
2700 East Leland Road  
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

## Table of Contents

Statement on Report Preparation.....	1
Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Action Letter.....	3
College Recommendation 1: SLO assessment	
College Recommendation 2: Brentwood Center alignment	
College Recommendation 3: Professional development plan	
College Recommendation 4: Disclosure of materials fees	
District Recommendation 2: Code of ethics	
District Recommendation 3: SLOs and faculty evaluation process	
District Recommendation 4: Evaluation of administrative organization, delineation of responsibilities, and governance and decision making structures	
Response to Self-identified Issues.....	15

## **Statement on Report Preparation**

Following receipt of the commission's post-visit communication in early 2009, the Los Medanos College president assigned specific managers to follow up on each of the four college recommendations. The District Office took a similar approach with its recommendations. The idea was to ensure that the recommendations were addressed and resolved in an expeditious manner and not allowed to languish due to inattention.

During 2010, LMC's interim president/ALO also identified a "responsible action agent" to address each of the college's self-identified issues. These employees, with responsibility for the issues being addressed, were charged with gathering information and putting together a draft of each response.

Status reports on accreditation issues were shared with the management team on a regular basis during 2010-11. District-level issues and responses were reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet.

On March 30, 2011, the Shared Governance Council (SGC) devoted a half-day retreat to accreditation. Those responsible for each college recommendation and self-identified issue presented information and requested feedback. The SGC also spent a significant amount on the self-identified issues involving improved communication and the need to increase participation in governance.

Drafts of all sections of the document were submitted to the ALO during April, 2011 – he then compiled a draft of the entire document. The overall draft was shared with the SGC and management team during June. The ALO also posted the draft on the college intranet and requested feedback. Based on the feedback from groups and individuals, the ALO revised and polished the draft during summer 2011.

Early in the fall semester, the final draft was endorsed by the SGC. In addition. On August 29, 2011, a College Assembly was held in order to brief the entire community on the contents of this report. The report was approved by the Governing Board at its September 14, 2011 meeting and then submitted on-time to the Commission.

Richard Livingston  
Interim President

# **Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter**

## **College Recommendation 1**

**Although the college has made significant strides in developing institutional and program SLOs, the team found that approximately 75 percent of the college's courses do not have SLOs as part of the course outline of record. Therefore, the team encourages the college to accomplish what it set out to do in meeting its timeline for reaching proficiency in its course-level SLOs by 2012. Furthermore, the team recommends that that process be implemented so that by 2012 the college will have developed and implemented methods for assessing those SLOs and use the results of those assessments to improve student learning in all its courses. (Standards IB1, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2g, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA6, IIA6a, IIB4, IIC1a, IIC2, IIIA1c)**

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college launched a major initiative to include course level student learning outcomes (CSLOs) in all course outlines of record (COORs). However, having achieved that milestone, the college still has work to do in assessing the CSLOs and providing evidence of systematically using the results to improve teaching and learning.

During the 2009-10 academic year, the college engaged in a sustained effort to update all COORs. As a result, currently all COORs have been updated and include CSLOs. A calendar for future COOR updates has been developed by the Curriculum Committee and Office of Instruction to ensure timely review and revision of all COORs within the Title 5 mandated five-year timeline.

Since the visiting team's recommendation, the college has spent substantial time and effort on evaluating and revising its SLO assessment model. Fortunately, for 2010-11 LMC was selected as one of 15 colleges in the state to receive a Bridging Research, Inquiry and Cultures (BRIC) initiative grant from the RP Group of California. As part of this grant, the college received technical assistance in three areas: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness Assessment, and Turning Data Into Meaningful Action. Each of these areas is closely tied to student learning outcomes assessment. LMC engaged in college-wide dialog to collectively determine the best way to move forward in the three areas using the 150 hours of technical expertise provided through BRIC. The project included the first BRIC meeting with the three technical experts in September, 2010, which was attended by members from all constituencies on campus. Next, a joint planning retreat of the Shared Governance Council (SGC), the Teaching and Learning Project (TLP), and the Academic Senate, was held in October 2010 to create the action plan for the remaining BRIC retreats on campus.

During January, 2011, the college used this action plan in an SLO retreat with the BRIC technical expert to re-evaluate its entire assessment cycle at all levels – course, program and “institutional” (degree/certificate). A second retreat with a BRIC expert was held in March, 2010 on Institutional Effectiveness, which is tied to assessment, and included representatives from TLP, LMC's Research and Planning Group (RP), and the SGC. Another retreat was held during May, 2011, around Turning Data Into Meaningful Action, and TLP, RP, and SGC representatives were again be key participants in this retreat. A final retreat, scheduled for early fall 2011, was on communication -- specifically to help the college in communicating assessment results.

During 2010-11, the TLP faculty also gathered data from the college to inform the project members about perceptions of the assessment process on campus and to generate ideas on how to move the college forward. This process included individual meetings, as well as department meetings, and a faculty survey. The results of the BRIC retreats, faculty dialog and survey are being used to improve the process of assessment at all levels. As a result of these activities, including the external experts' input, TLP members determined that the current SLO model was too complex and cumbersome. Therefore, during spring 2011, the TLP began developing a proposal to restructure its membership, as well as to create more streamlined and better aligned cycles for the assessment process at all levels -- CSLO, PSLO and ISLO. These changes will facilitate both the meaningful work of assessment to improve student learning and meet with accreditation compliance. The proposed revision of the assessment process for student learning outcomes assessment, including the leadership and membership structure, will be presented to the Academic Senate and Shared Governance Council when completed in fall 2011.

Also during 2010-11, the college engaged in a substantial amount of work around CSLO assessment. To head up the effort, the college provided reassigned time for a CSLO faculty lead, who is also the Curriculum Committee Chair. The lead worked extensively with faculty, staff, and managers on creating templates and structures for completing assessment. This lead also coached faculty on completing various parts of the assessment cycle, including the assessment plan, data collection, review, and use of results (improvement plan). Also during 2010-11, the college supported a technical web designer to build an in-house data collection system called CLASS -- Course-Level Assessment Software System. The software system was created and piloted. However, given the complexity of the system and the amount of data being collected at the student level, the system was not deemed effective. Therefore, the CLASS system was not fully implemented. The college is currently using Word documents and housing the faculty work on the college computer network's public drive. LMC is currently looking at alternative methods of collecting data in order to provide evidence of improved teaching and learning at the course level.

While the database was being developed and the research conducted, the CSLO faculty lead continued to work with faculty to complete the assessment of CSLOs. However, this is an area the college needs to improve rapidly. As of this writing, of approximately 600 courses, 145 have assessment plans in place, and 63 have completed the process through the improvement plan stage. To help with the planning process, and to move the college forward, the department chairs, who are now charged with assessment as part of their reassigned time load, were asked to complete a grid that shows all of the courses and the semester in which they will be assessed through the 2012-2013 academic year (with 100 percent to be assessed by 2012-13). The grids were completed and sent to the faculty lead and the Office of Instruction. The faculty lead and senior academic manager are reviewing these grids during fall. This list will be sent to the TLP, the deans and the department chairs for additional follow up.

The TLP-proposed revised assessment model, if adopted by the Academic Senate and the Shared Governance Council, will be implemented in 2012-13, including the revised cycles for assessment, leadership, and membership. The academic year 2011-12 is a transition and "catch up" year.

#### **Additional plans:**

Under the leadership of the TLP, the college will continue refine its approach to the assessment of student learning outcomes, with a focus on meeting the commission's 2012 expectations. Assessment results will be used to improve teaching and learning.

**EVIDENCE:**

1. Proposed timeline for updating COORs from department chairs
2. Action Plan for BRIC retreats
3. Notes from BRIC retreats
4. Assessment forms – planning, collection, improvement (single paper form)
5. Snapshots of CLASS
6. Excel spreadsheet of CSLO completion by course (Janice’s worksheet)
7. Individual departmental scheduling grids through 2012-2013 academic year
8. Summary of departmental grids with gaps

## College Recommendation 2

**The team recommends that the college develop mechanisms to ensure the closer alignment of the Brentwood Center with college operations, services and practices. (Standards IIB3a, IIC.1.c, III.C.1.c, IVA.1)**

Los Medanos College continues to make progress in aligning its two locations: the main campus in Pittsburg and the Brentwood Center. Although coordination existed previously, since the visiting team's recommendation was written, the college has taken a number of concrete steps to improve alignment, which are outlined in this response.

LMC's interim president has given clear and repeated messages to his management team that the expansion of services at the Brentwood Center is a college priority. As the district/college financial situation has worsened, he has also made it clear that Brentwood should not suffer disproportionately from the reductions for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12.

For a number of years, administrative oversight for the Brentwood Center was exercised by a faculty coordinator with 100 percent reassigned time; she reported to an academic dean located at the main campus. While the coordinator did a fine job, alignment between the two locations was not always optimal. And the college needed more of management presence in Brentwood, as required as the college seeks formal center status for Brentwood. In order to improve the situation, the interim college president, in collaboration chancellor and president of Diablo Valley College, arranged for the executive dean of the DVC's San Ramon Campus, to have management responsibility for both centers. Following a transition in spring 2011, the executive dean assumed his duties in June 2011.

For his Brentwood responsibilities, the executive dean reports to the LMC president and is a member of the President's Cabinet. The new structure is designed to improve management communication and oversight of the Brentwood Center. The structure will be evaluated for effectiveness once it has been in place for at least one semester.

Student Services have been expanded significantly in Brentwood in order to better serve those taking classes at that location. In order to coordinate those services and to serve as a liaison with the main campus, a student services and instructional support coordinator was hired during fall 2009. The classified staff member hired for the position was working at the main campus, so she had the background to provide the required coordination. She was joined by a full-time counselor – the first full-timer to be assigned to that location. The counselor conducts workshops and teaches counseling courses, in addition to providing appointments and drop-in coverage. The college has also created a mechanism by which the counselor and students in Brentwood can access transcripts, which are necessary during counseling sessions. Starting in August, 2009, Admissions and Records staffing in Brentwood was increased from 2.0 to 2.75 FTE and the college's director of admissions and records has provided additional training for the employees

at that location. As a result, most A&R services that are provided in Pittsburg are now provided in Brentwood.

There are other expanded student services in Brentwood, which have been implemented in collaboration with the main campus:

- Financial Aid services are available one day per week.
- DSPS counseling is also available one day per week.
- Expanded information/outreach is offered to Brentwood students, including welcome days and student services information tables.
- Transfer Center has arranged to university representatives to visit Brentwood.
- Career Center has offered classroom workshops, information tables and career consultation appointments.
- The Employment Center provides job referral information and workshops.

Instructional support and instruction has also increased and/or improved at the center. Brentwood's first classified lab coordinator was hired in August, 2009. New space for the Math Lab and for tutoring was added in January, 2010. Tutoring and reading/writing consultations, delivered in conjunction with The Center for Academic Support on the main campus, are now available 16 hours per week in Brentwood. Both the Math Lab and tutoring services are heavily used by students. Several "smart classrooms", equipped with the latest instructional technology, were also added. The computer lab for instruction and for student use has also been upgraded – the PCs are now as good, or better, than those in Pittsburg. Several other student-use computers have been added at various locations in the center. Brentwood computers have now been placed on the same replacement rotation as those on the main campus. Also, reserve books are now available for students on-site, similar to the arrangement in Pittsburg.

Finally, when one of the four full-time math instructors retired, through its faculty allocation process the college allocated a full-time replacement – despite the current severe financial limitations. The center coordinator has produced a draft human resources plan (the Short and Long Range planning document) which calls for an increased full-time faculty presence in Brentwood, once hiring resumes.

LMC has also demonstrated its commitment to Brentwood in terms of facilities. Since the last visit, the college has added four classrooms and the tutoring lab in the existing facility – a remodeled super market in a small strip mall. Of greater long-term importance, at its November 2010 meeting the Governing Board authorized expenditure of \$4.8 million to purchase 17 acres south of Brentwood, funded by local bond revenues, on which it intends to build a permanent center. The district and college have produced a needs study, initial project proposal, final project proposal (summer 2011) and environmental impact report for the proposed facility. LMC will be applying for official "center status" for Brentwood during 2011-12. The Governing Board, college management team and Shared Governance Council have received regular updates

on planning for the project. The executive dean is developing a plan to include employees from both locations in the more detailed planning for the permanent center.

Finally, LMC continues to strive to improve collaboration and communication with Brentwood Center. During academic year 2010-11, the chancellor and interim president met several times with employees located in Brentwood to share information and discuss items of mutual interest, particularly budgetary issues. The Academic Senate has an official Brentwood representative, a Brentwood classified staff member sits on the Shared Governance Council and a faculty member serves on the Curriculum Committee. In addition to these specific positions, more general discussions are underway on how to improve Brentwood employees' participation in college governance processes. During May 2011, a 10<sup>th</sup> year celebration for the center (at its current location) was held with extensive participation from employees at both locations and significant community participation.

In summary, LMC has made progress in aligning Brentwood Center and main campus operations, services and practices.

**Additional plans:**

Led by the newly-hired executive dean, the college will continue to expand instruction and services at the Brentwood, with a focus on alignment between the two locations. LMC will also apply for official center status and continue more detailed planning for the permanent center.

**EVIDENCE:**

Governing Board Agenda and Minutes, November 10, 2010  
Brentwood Center Short and Long Range Planning, September, 2010  
Key Aspects Planning for the Brentwood Center, May, 2011  
Brentwood Center: Initial Project Proposal

## College Recommendation 3

**In order to increase effectiveness and respond fully to the previous team recommendation, the team recommends that the college implement an integrated professional development plan to ensure that employees have regular structured training on information technology and instructional design. (Standard III.C.1.d)**

The college has designed and implemented an integrated professional development plan. A task force was set up to analyze college professional development and to recommend changes/improvements. It developed a proposal that included mission, values, outcomes and guidelines and operational procedures. The proposal was accepted by the Shared Governance Council (SGC) and college president.

As a result, the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) was formed during spring 2010. This shared governance group receives annual charges from the SGC. The structure provides for six PDAC standing committees, including one on technology.

There have been several action-responses to the accreditation team's recommendation specific to the need for regular training on information technology and instructional design, including:

- A.** Distance Education Strategic Plan (February 2009);
- B.** Creation of a Technology Sub-Committee of the college-wide PDAC;
- C.** Professional Development in on-line instruction and instructional design;
- D.** Various technology trainings.

**A. A Distance Education Strategic Plan** was written by the shared governance Distance Education Task Force, which has representation of faculty, classified staff and managers. The purpose of the plan is *“to provide recommendations and direction to the college in providing online services of rigor, breadth and depth that are substantiated through an ongoing cycle of planning, assessment and improvement.”* The plan includes four (4) Distance Education-related goals, with the fourth goal directly tied to Professional Development: *“To ensure high quality online instruction, LMC will provided sufficient training to all faculty interested in teaching online .... Training will be provided to address both pedagogical and technical needs ....”*

There is a related objective to provide quality online educational opportunities that are seamless in delivery both pedagogically and technically. Recommended strategies include: 1) on-going PD opportunities for all faculty who teach on-line; 2) establishment of a resource library; 3) coordination with sister colleges and district; and 4) marketing of PD opportunities. Work on these four strategies is underway.

**B. LMC's shared governance Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) has created a Technology Sub-Committee.** This PDAC sub-committee – along with the campus Local Planning Group, which oversees flex opportunities for faculty, and the Distance Education Committee – works closely with the other two groups to implement the goals and objectives of the Distance Education Strategic Plan.

**C. Professional Development in On-Line Instruction and Instructional Design** has been offered through various means, including:

- Flex and non-flex workshops/training activities throughout the semester -- approximately 12 options throughout each semester, with an average of 15 faculty in attendance at each.
- On-line resources available on the professional development web-site and webinar; and other opportunities are sent electronically to faculty through e-mail.
- Funding for individual faculty members to attend conferences, workshops and trainings regarding information technology and instructional design.

**D. Technology Trainings** are available throughout the year for all faculty, classified staff and managers to become more familiar and comfortable with the use of current and emerging technologies. The opportunities are publicized through “everyone at LMC” e-mail distributions.

**Additional plans:**

The college will continue to refine and evaluate its redesigned professional development programs. Particular emphasis will be placed on information technology and instructional design, in order to fully address the recommendation.

**EVIDENCE:**

## College Recommendation 4

**The visiting team recommends the institution comply with the audit recommendation to disclose all instructional materials fees in the class schedule or course catalog.**

The college catalog and the class schedule state “an optional material fee may be applied” in each of the classes that may have material fees, based on Board Policy 5024. The information conforms to the State Chancellor’s Office Student Fee Handbook. Where applicable, in the schedule class description a statement such as “an optional materials fee may be applied” is included. The catalog explains that the fee may only be charged if the materials have value to the student outside of the classroom setting and/or the end product has continuing value. Students are informed that they may purchase the materials on their own or choose to pay the materials fee.

For classes that have known amounts, the specific amount is specified in the description of the class. For example, for Emergency Medical Technician I that statement is “Materials lab fee of \$50 required to be paid...” At the beginning of each semester, faculty members are reminded to include material fees information in their syllabi.

To determine the optional/mandatory material fees amount charged to each student, evidence of the cost to the District (invoice/purchase order) and the justification/documentation for requiring the student to pay instructional material fees is included. If the justification indicates that it is cheaper for the District to buy in bulk, rather than if the student were to purchase on his/her own, it is stated as such. Also the cost to the District includes the cost of the item, plus shipping, tax and any other expenses related to the purchase of the instructional material(s).

All material fees are paid at the Bookstore or the Cashier’s Office. When the Cashier’s Office is closed, i.e. Saturday, the faculty members are responsible for collecting the fees and depositing them the next business day with the Cashier’s Office.

**Additional plans:** The college has complied with this recommendation.

### **EVIDENCE:**

2011-12 College Catalog, page 13  
Fall 2011 Class Schedule, page 6  
Board Policy 5024, Student Fees

## **District Recommendation 2**

**In order to meet the standard, the district should establish a written code of professional ethics, which includes managers. (III.A.1.d)**

The Governing Board adopted new Board Policy 2056, Code of Ethics, at its October 21, 2009, meeting. This new policy addresses all members of the District community, including managers. The policy emphasizes the need to apply “the highest ethical principles and standards of conduct to all members of the District community...” It addresses the principles of “trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, and stewardship.”

In addition, Human Resources Procedure 1040.08, Employee Code of Ethical Behavior, previously adopted by the Chancellor’s Cabinet on April 5, 2005, includes all District and college administrators. The procedure calls on employees to “be worthy of the respect and confidence of the community we serve.” It goes on to delineate specific characteristics of ethical behavior for employees.

**Additional plans:** This recommendation has been addressed and resolved.

**EVIDENCE:**

Board Policy 2056, Code of Ethics

Human Resources Procedure 1040.08, Employee Code of Ethical Behavior

### **District Recommendation 3**

**In order to meet the standard, the district should integrate student learning outcomes into the evaluation process for those who have a direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)**

The two areas of focus on student learning outcomes in the required self-evaluation are: “I use appropriate and varied tools for evaluating and assessing student learning outcomes” and “I participate in department committees/tasks (i.e. curriculum development, SLOs, Course Outline/Title 5 Rewrites/Content Review).” Each faculty member must rate him or herself on these two focus areas, which in then incorporated into the overall evaluation.

In a related change, the United Faculty and District agreed to modify Article 6.2.3.2 to add to department chair duties to “oversee and facilitate the development and assessment of course and program-level student learning outcomes.”

**Additional plans:** This recommendation has been addressed and resolved.

**EVIDENCE:**

United Faculty self evaluation guidelines

## District Recommendation 4

**In order to meet standards, the district should develop a policy and implement procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the district’s administrative organization, the delineation of responsibilities of the district and the colleges, and the governance and decision making structures. The results should be widely communicated and used as a basis for improvement. (IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.B.E, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.e, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)**

This is a far-reaching recommendation that goes to the heart of how the CCCCDC ensures it provides quality service to students and how the District conducts business. This recommendation asks the District to evaluate the effectiveness of its: 1) administrative organization; 2) college and District roles/responsibilities; and 3) governance and decision-making structures. The District’s administrative organization is referenced in the Rules and Regulations of the Governing Board, while the roles and responsibilities of the colleges and District are referenced in the document of the same name. The governance and decision-making structure, as a whole, is now defined in Board Policy 1009.

The recommendation also asks the District to develop a policy and implement procedures for this evaluation process. The District already had two policies in this area, but needed to revise them in order to provide clarification regarding institutional leadership/governance and institutional effectiveness. Those two revised policies, Board Policy 1009 (with related Administrative Procedure 1009.01) and Board Policy 1012 (with related Administrative Procedure 1012.01), are submitted as evidence. In addition, the District Governance Survey has been developed and implemented to solicit feedback from stakeholders on the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making process.

The chart below summarizes actions taken to satisfy District Accreditation Recommendation 4:

Policy/Procedure/Survey	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board Policy 1009, <u>Institutional Leadership and Governance</u></li> </ul>	Revised to include institutional leadership and alignment with the governance and decision-making structure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Procedure 1009.01, <u>Participatory Governance</u></li> </ul>	Acknowledges the “participatory” governance structure and includes management in that structure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board Policy 1012, <u>Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement</u></li> </ul>	Revised to address institutional effectiveness and broaden the scope to include assessment, continuous improvement, and a linkage to budget allocations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Procedure 1012.01, <u>Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement</u></li> </ul>	New procedure which delineates roles and responsibilities and addresses assessment and continuous improvement activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Governance Survey</li> </ul>	Developed to solicit feedback from District stakeholders and assess the effectiveness of the District’s governance and decision-making structure

**Additional plans:** Based on the revised policies and procedures, the District will regularly evaluate its effectiveness, widely communicate the results and use the information as a basis for improvement.

**EVIDENCE:**

Board Policy 1009, Institutional Leadership and Governance  
Administrative Procedure 1009.01, Participatory Governance  
Board Policy 1012, Institutional Effectiveness  
Administrative Procedure 1012.01, Institutional Effectiveness  
District governance survey results

# **Response to Self-identified Issues**

## **Standard 1**

**I.B.1 The SGC will develop a process by which there is more regular and continuous communication by institutional groups. For example, all standing committees can publish their agendas and minutes on the college website, or distribute them to all employees via campus e-mail.**

All shared governance committees now have either web-page or and intranet presence accessible to all employees through LMC's web-site. Agendas, minutes and committee documents are available on these pages. Several of the committees also send agendas and/or minutes to the campus community through e-mail. The Shared Governance Council itself also communicates significant actions/outcomes to the college community after each of its meetings by using the "everyone at LMC" e-mail feature.

**I.B.4 SGC, in collaboration with upper management, will more clearly articulate processes, develop ways to motivate constituents to participate in the planning, resource allocation processes and committees in general, enhance trust among colleagues, and improve communication to all.**

During spring 2011, SGC hosted a retreat which focused the afternoon activities on developing strategies to motivate constituents to participate in shared governance committees and other organizations, groups and committees, and related activities. The lively discussion identified current challenges and barriers regarding participation and generated some ideas to address these issues. The discussion led to a detailed work plan and time line, which was approved by SGC in April, 2011; implementation began in summer 2011. This plan includes professional development activities, the creation of a multi-constituent Leadership Academy for fall '11, development and implementation of a college-wide Respect Campaign and SGC's modeling of effective engagement practices.

**I.B.7 All program leads will evaluate the results of assessment cycles in order to implement improvements in programs.**

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has continued to revise the Program Review, Assessment, and Planning Templates annually, based on feedback from the units and programs involved in the processes. Units and programs are using the revised template to improve not only student learning through assessment, but also their units and programs.

More specifically, the Teaching and Learning Project (TLP) has done substantial work in evaluating assessment cycles at all levels -- course, program, and institutional. Part of this evaluation included a 37-question survey to all faculty, with a high response rate of 87.5 percent of full-time and 25 percent of part-time faculty. A proposed modified assessment model will help provide stronger integration of Program Review and SLO assessment. The new timelines and cycles are currently being vetted and slated to be implemented in 2012-13. During the current academic year, the college continues its work under the existing model, which has been revised since the 2008 self-study. The college continues to improve its processes based on annual feedback.

During 2010-11, the TLP utilized the Title 5 definition of programs to clarify what constitutes a program at the college. The clarification resulted in a more reasonable assessment of authentic program level student learning outcomes.

The college will implement a process of peer review for the Unit/Program Review in 2011-12. The Shared Governance Council (SGC) is identifying the Peer Review Committee membership structure, based on recommendations from the Research and Planning Committee. Peer reviews will be based on a rubric and conducted by cross-constituent teams to better inform programs on ways to improve program/unit performance.

Prior to 2008, the TLP was responsible for coordinating feedback on program-level assessment. Subsequently, the TLP was in transition and did not conduct as thorough a review or coordinate program assessment results. A proposed new assessment model may fold into the peer review process, but that approach is still in discussion. Once the new model is in place, the TLP will once again take a lead role in coordinating assessment review and feedback.

**II. A.1.b During the 2008-09 academic year, the Distance Education Committee and Research Office will engage a study to evaluate the effectiveness, retention and success rates of online courses at LMC; the committee will investigate the feasibility of an entirely online associate degree.**

During 2009, the Office of Institutional Research completed a study on student achievement in online courses, compared to face-to-face courses, and a hybrid course. The results of this study were analyzed and discussed in the Distance Education Committee and the Shared Governance Council.

The comparative and longitudinal study over a two-year period included information on success, retention, and persistence, as well as demographic characteristics. Student success, retention, and persistence varied in online courses during this time period, based on the course students took. In general, during this period, student success, retention, and persistence were lower in online courses, compared to the comparable face-to-face course. Similarly, student success and persistence in the hybrid course, compared to the face-to-face course, were also lower. However, student achievement in the same hybrid course, as compared to the online course, varied, with comparable retention results, but higher success and persistence.

In terms of demographics, the study showed that students taking online courses tended to be younger (under age 24), white or Hispanic, female, with long-term goals, and from the local service area. Compared to the college student body population, there was a higher proportion of younger students who were female and white in online courses, compared to the face-to-face courses.

The Distance Education Committee also began the study of the possibility of an entirely online degree. The committee worked with the district office on a possible study across the three colleges. The committee discussed several challenges in designing/implementing an online degree, including lack of curricular supports (course development, instructors), lack of funds and lack of professional development. Given the identified challenges, combined with the relatively low student achievement in online courses compared to face-to-face courses, and the increasingly difficult budget situation which emerged in 2010-11, the study was not fully completed or vetted. Expansion on online offerings is not an option at present since the college is making significant cuts to its course offerings during 2010-11 and 2011-12.

**II.A.1.c The Teaching and Learning Project will develop and implement processes and professional development activities to ensure that the assessment cycle is completed – that is, that assessment results are used to make improvements at the course, program and institutional levels.**

Since 2008, the Teaching and Learning Project (TLP) has provided a variety of professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators on assessment and related topics.

A major focus of assessment has been at the course level. Given the amount of work needed to be completed, beginning in fall 2010 the TLP included a faculty lead, with reassigned time, for course-level student learning outcomes (CSLO) as part of its membership. The CSLO lead has held several training workshops, seminars, and has provided one-on-one coaching. Professional development trainings, including hands-on workshops in computer labs, have been held during flex days, all-college days, and throughout the semester. The college has reserved two hours on Mondays as a time for “all-college” activities, when full-time faculty are not scheduled to teach, so that the institution can address college priorities, including assessment. During a typical semester, three or four Monday afternoon meetings have been devoted to professional development activities directly related to assessment.

During 2010-11, the TLP Faculty Lead attended several Department Chair meetings to inform the chairs about assessment, including proposed changes in the model and cycles, and the progress of assessment. This communication will be ongoing.

Currently, the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC), is working with various campus committees to target professional development opportunities to specific needs on campus. A member of PDAC has attended TLP meetings and works closely with the TLP members as areas for professional development are identified.

During fall 2010, three managers and a classified staff member attended the Student Success Conference, which included a significant assessment component. Those who attended are part of the TLP and presented their findings to the other TLP members.

Assessment-related professional development at the individual, department, and college-level will continue.

**II.A.2.h The Curriculum Committee and Teaching and Learning Project will develop and implement faculty development activities to improve alignment of student learning outcomes, assessment and grading practices.**

During 2009-2010, a substantial amount of work was done by faculty members, and approved by the Curriculum Committee, to update Course Outlines of Record (COORs), which resulted in better alignment among student learning outcomes, assessment and grading. Currently, almost all COORs have course level student learning outcomes (CSLOs) that are aligned to program level outcomes (PSLOs), and include grading standards based on assessment levels of “above proficiency”, “meets proficiency”, or “below proficiency.” This work was completed through several “Camp COOR” workshops conducted by the Curriculum Committee chair. The chair, who is also the TLP CSLO lead, provided coaching to groups, as well as to individuals.

Additionally, beginning in 2010-11, the TLP CSLO lead worked with faculty to implement CSLO assessment. Faculty wrote planning forms, collected data and wrote improvement plans where needed. As part of the planning process, faculty members identified proficiencies for each of the CSLOs for their courses. This work was also completed through the coaching by the CSLO faculty lead, as well as other faculty leaders on campus who were involved in the process.

The TLP is currently reviewing the data collection and alignment processes on campus. The TLP experimented with a home-grown electronic system of tracking and aggregating data. However, during the pilot the TLP evaluated its usage and determined there is a better way to collect data and stronger ways to ensure alignment. The TLP is currently reviewing the Program Review templates as a mechanism to collect not only PSLO information, but CSLO information as well. This approach will aid in the alignment between CLSO and PSLO assessments, as well as tie it to planning. Professional development on the revised approach will occur when the model is completed.

**II.B.1 The Student Services Planning Task Force will develop annual goals for Student Services as a whole, during 2008-09. These goals will be folded into student learning outcomes for each program/service and an annual assessment will follow at the end of the academic year, evaluating the progress and/or achievement of those goals.**

While the development of Student Services goals did not occur according to the anticipated schedule, the goals are now in place and they will inform future student learning outcomes for Student Services. The goals were drafted in spring 2010 by the Student Services Planning Committee. During the fall 2010 semester, all Student Services employees had the opportunity to review and discuss the draft goals and provide feedback. Based on the feedback received and further discussion, the goals were revised and finalized at the end of the fall semester. Given the delay in developing the goals, they will remain in place through spring, 2012.

During the spring 2012 semester, the Student Services Planning Committee will initiate an assessment of progress made on the goals and the relationship to student learning outcomes for Student Services programs.

**II.B.3.a The Counseling staff and Student Services managers will explore the feasibility of web-based counseling, so that more comprehensive and secure counseling services can be offered online.**

The counseling staff has explored the feasibility of offering web-based counseling, but has not been able to design a mechanism that would adequately address the issue of student privacy. However, the present protocol offers students an email response from a counselor that is delivered within 48 hours, but is not “live.”

Once LMC students are provided a secure college e-mail account – which was being implemented gradually during spring 2011 – the college should be able to provide students “live chat” counseling through Web Advisor. The plan is to pilot this new service during fall semester, 2011

**II.B.3.a The director of student life will develop a strategic plan to address program development and goals, as well as related budget and staffing needs.**

During fall 2010, the Office of Student Life completed a three-year strategic plan. The planning team was led by the director of student life and included the student life coordinator and the dean of student development. The basis of the plan was a mission statement: “We provide leadership development opportunities that support students in becoming agents of positive social change and responsible members of a diverse and global community”. It also included a vision statement: “We will be a hub of student engagement and leadership development at Los Medanos College.”

More specifically, in the strategic plan the team identified goals/objectives with related timelines for measuring progress in five areas: policies and procedures; equipment, technology and facilities; communication and marketing; programs and partnerships; and budget and staffing. The Office of Student life achieved many of the outcomes specified for year one (2010-11) of the plan.

**II. B.3.f Admissions and Records will implement and then evaluate the policy and procedure changes that are designed to protect the integrity of student grades and evaluate the changes during 2008-09.**

The Admissions and Records directors continue to monitor the colleges' grade changes each month by running a report, attaching each item of back-up and checking the report with the back-up documentation. Since performing the monthly grade change report, there have been no irregularities or inconsistencies in any grade changes.

In September, 2008, the district undertook a project to import legacy records into Datatel's Colleague system in order to respond to accreditation questions and issues at Diablo Valley College. Because of this project, additional A&R personnel were given access to the grade change screen (STAC) and an additional report was developed to monitor the importing of these records. Because of lack of district funding, the project was discontinued in 2010; however, the colleges were directed to continue importing legacy records since students need the coursework for transcripts or graduation. The report is run and checked monthly by the Admissions and Records directors.

The district routinely performs compliance assessment pursuant to Student Services Procedure 3028 -- the most recent audit was completed in March, 2010. The results of this audit were favorable regarding the college's compliance to the policies set out in Board Policy 3024, Recording Grade Changes and Securing Student Records.

## **II.C.1 The April 2008 proposal Tutoring/Academic Support Services at LMC: Proposal to the SGC will be implemented beginning in fall of 2008 and evaluated at the end of the first academic year.**

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has made changes to the tutoring services and continues to evaluate the changes and make improvements. During 2009, tutoring and reading and writing services moved into a permanent location, at the center of the College Complex, now called the Center for Academic Support. The new location provides greater access and visibility for all students. The center offers various opportunities for support, including peer tutoring, faculty reading and writing consultants and a *The Professor Is In* program with faculty.

The Center for Academic Support has engaged various assessment activities which then resulted in changes to the services and procedures of the center. Activities include assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty observations, and meetings with an assessment consultant.

SLO assessment activities involving tutoring are coordinated through the Tutoring Support Team (TST). During 2009, this team created tutoring SLOs that aligned with the Library and Learning SLOs. At this time, the TST also created learning outcomes for the peer tutors (TSLOs) to better inform the tutor training curriculum. Assessment for SLO #1 (tutees) was conducted in fall, 2009. Based on the results, the team revised the survey and implemented it again in spring, 2010 at both the Pittsburg and Brentwood locations. The team also conducted assessment on SLO #2. Results of the assessments were used to improve tutor training and used in the Program Review process. Assessment of SLOs is ongoing. The TST will conduct assessment of tutors (TSLOs) during this semester, and use the results in spring 2012.

Beginning in 2009, the Center for Academic Support Coordinator began documenting changes in tutor training based on the training evaluations. These evaluations are dynamic and inform the initial and ongoing training of students each semester. During fall, 2010, tutor training sessions held during the semester were reduced due to budget cuts. Evaluations and observations of the services indicated that the decrease in training had an impact on the quality of tutoring, so trainings were re-established for spring 2011. Tutor training evaluations continue to be conducted by the Center for Academic Support Coordinator and will inform training of tutors throughout the semester.

In spring 2010, the Center for Academic Support Coordinator began conducting and using Tutor Self-Evaluations. These evaluations are completed each semester and are used to inform the coordinator about training strengths, gaps and needs. Results are used within the same semester during the follow up tutor training sessions, as well as in the new trainings in subsequent semesters.

Beginning in fall, 2010, the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead conducted observations of most of the faculty consultants working in the Center for Academic Support. The observations were based on a rubric and used for dialog with faculty one-on-one around pedagogy. The rest of the consultants were evaluated in spring, 2011. These observations will be ongoing, conducted by the faculty lead, and used to improve teaching and learning.

The Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead also developed a “Regulars Study.” This study was administered beginning in spring, 2011 and is conducted with students who regularly use the Reading and Writing Consultant services. The results will be shared with all Reading and Writing Consultants and used to improve teaching and learning.

The senior academic manager, Center for Academic Support coordinator, and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead have been working with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) team to assess services in the Center for Academic Support through an “equity lens.” Surveys and observation protocols were developed and revised in fall 2010 for students and faculty in English 90 courses, as well as those using the tutoring and reading and writing services in the Center for Academic Support. Surveys and observations were conducted in spring, 2011 and used to inform the CUE team on campus, as well as the Center for Academic Support, on ways to improve teaching and learning for all students. The senior academic manager, who is also a participant in the CUE project, was responsible for the observations, and for the coordination of using the results of all assessment measures.

The Center for Academic Support coordinator and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead used contacts from the *International Writing Centers Association* conference they attended in summer 2010 to inform them about assessment and evaluation practices. In addition, managers and the Center for Academic Support coordinator met with a consultant from City College of San Francisco, on methods of assessment in tutoring. The faculty, staff, and managers planned to meet with the District research office in summer 2011 to determine a research plan for assessment to be conducted in fall, 2011. The senior academic manager will be responsible for spearheading the evaluation, and will coordinate efforts around using the results for improved teaching and learning.

**II.C.1.b During the 2008-09 academic year, the librarians, in conjunction with the Academic Senate, interested faculty and other appropriate college committees and/or bodies, will explore the need for an information literacy requirement or proficiency.**

At the spring 2008 plenary session, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) passed a resolution stating: “Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to ensure that students demonstrate information competency and provide advice and assistance to local senates that seek to institute new requirements in information competency” (Resolution 9.04, Spring 2008).

In March, 2009, the Los Medanos College Academic Senate discussed the formation of a task force on information competency that would be charged with investigating whether or not information competency learning outcomes are embedded in existing curriculum; documenting those existing outcomes and identifying gaps in the curriculum; and addressing the possible need for a stand-alone graduation requirement. The task force would have been responsible for examining the different ways information competency instruction could be delivered, such as infusing it into existing curriculum, offering a course dedicated to the subject, or as different modules added to existing related courses.

In anticipation of the college adopting an information competency graduation requirement, the Library Department redesigned its Library Studies 14 course in the fall of 2007 to better address the Association of College and Research Libraries’ information literacy/competency standards. The course in its new form, Library Research and Information Literacy Skills, was launched in spring 2008. This course is currently used by some students from both DVC and CCC to meet the Information Competency graduation requirement at those colleges.

More recently, the passage of SB1440 has had a significant impact on the discussion of an information competency graduation requirement. The resulting focus on local graduation requirements, which are not allowed to be part of the new SB1440 transfer degrees, led the LMC Academic Senate to vote to revisit all LMC graduation requirements. An information competency graduation requirement is a part of those discussions, which are currently underway. In addition to the discussions in the Academic Senate, and while decisions surrounding existing curriculum are being going on, a needs assessment can still be performed to gather data on the current information competency skill level of LMC students and whether that skill level needs to be addressed with additional instruction. The Library Department is taking the lead on performing the needs assessment in fall, 2011.

**II. C.1.c The librarians, in collaboration with other learning support services and the Brentwood Center staff, will secure a permanent space with access to computers for learning support services in Brentwood by fall 2009.**

Since the last self study, LMC has significantly increased space for learning support services at the Brentwood Center.

During 2010, the college was able to secure additional leased space from the City of Brentwood in the existing facility. As a result, classroom 13 was converted into space to be used for the Tutoring and Reading and Writing Center. Two computers were added to the new space for use by faculty and students involved in the consultation process.

The college also established a coordinator of student services position at Brentwood. As a result, a conference room was converted into a Student Services Resource Center. Two computers were installed to allow students to access their information through WebAdvisor.

Brentwood also has a computer classroom which is available for student drop-in use, when it is not actually scheduled for classes.

**II.C.1.c The staff of the Reading and Writing Center will develop a plan for the Brentwood Center that includes a permanent space with additional computer work stations and expanded hours to meet the needs of students at that location. This plan will be completed by the spring 2009 semester and implemented as resources become available.**

Since the completion of the Self Study in 2008, the college has improved services for reading and writing at the Brentwood Center. During 2009, reading and writing services were increased from 6 to 12 hours per week. However, due to budget limitations, combined with limited student use, consultation hours were limited to 9 hours per week during fall 2010 at the Brentwood Center.

Prior to fall 2010, there was limited space for consultations, forcing instructors to hold consultations in any available office. Additional space was added to the center, so currently the Reading and Writing Consultation services and tutors share a dedicated room for all tutoring services. In addition, Brentwood students can access the online consultation services available to all LMC students.

The college will continue to monitor Reading and Writing Center services to ensure appropriate levels of support and services at the Brentwood Center.

**II. C.2 Reading and Writing Center staff will provide professional development on ways to utilize the center for faculty and students, including a FLEX activity on writing clear assignments and connecting students to the RWC for reading and writing needs.**

The college provides several opportunities for professional development related to reading and writing activities, including conferences, faculty trainings and one-on-one coaching

The Center for Academic Support Coordinator and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead attended the *International Writing Centers Association* Conference in summer 2010, which included the following topics: Writing center pedagogy; multilingual writer; diversity and writing center work; writing center leadership; writing center research; writing center assessment; tutor development. The faculty and staff have utilized contacts from this conference to gain a better understanding about assessing the center -- they will continue to use what they have learned to assess and improve services.

The Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead coordinates monthly workshops for faculty and staff on topics related to the reading and writing services. These workshops are conducted by faculty and are based on needs at that time. Non-RWC individuals are invited as guests and are welcome to attend. Usually guests are faculty; however, other guests include a DSPS counselor, representatives from IDEA, and the senior academic manager.

The Center for Academic Support coordinator and the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead conduct flex activities for the campus around reading and writing needs. Workshops were scheduled in August 2010 on *How to Design Great Writing Assignments and Guide Students: Through Them (Without Killing Yourself or Others)*, and in January 2011 on *Scaffolding writing assignments and using the Center for Academic Support*. There were no participants for the second flex, so the members reviewed the workshop needs. Flex workshops are coordinated primarily by the Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead and are ongoing.

The Reading and Writing Consultants Faculty Lead meets with reading and writing consultants on their individual sessions. The faculty lead observes the sessions and evaluates the faculty member based on a rubric. The evaluations are used in dialog to improve teaching and learning. Observations are conducted by the Faculty Lead and are ongoing.

**II.C.2 The Library and Learning Support Services Committee will work with the professional development committee to offer targeted professional development in SLOs and their assessment to campus computer lab staff by spring 2009.**

The Library and Learning Support Services Committee was transformed into the Tutoring Support Team (TST), which includes members from LLSS and tutoring across college labs. This committee created student learning outcomes in 2008 for all tutoring services on campus, including the Brentwood Center. During 2009, the committee approved four common SLOs for all tutoring labs. The TST has completed the assessment cycle for the first SLO, including survey administration, data collection, and dialog based on the results. Earlier in fall 2011, the TST met to plan the assessment of the second SLO. The committee will convene in May to discuss the results and make improvements.

Professional development occurs in various forms throughout the assessment cycle. In 2008, a facilitator from the professional development committee met with the TST to develop SLOs. Since 2008, the TST has met a minimum of twice a semester to discuss SLOs and make improvements based on the results of assessment and dialog. Dialog and discussion are ongoing. The TST would benefit from more targeted professional development in analyzing SLOs.

**III.A.2 The college president and faculty organizations will work with the District to address the under representation of full-time faculty at LMC (compared to the other two colleges in the CCCCD).**

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has made strides in increasing the number of full-time faculty, in spite of significant overall budget reductions for the District and college.

At the time the self study was written, the college had 107 full-time faculty. Using the “Box 2A process”, which was how the District allocated full-time faculty, during academic year 2008-09 the District allocated six new faculty positions to Los Medanos College and grant funds were used to create a seventh position. During the fall, 2009 semester, new full-time faculty were hired in anthropology, biology, math, counseling, drama, English and MESA, which increased the number of full-timers to 114.

Based on analysis of its own needs and a recommendation from the Accrediting Commission, the District developed a new financial allocation model, based on the State SB361 model, which was implemented for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This model allocates operating funds to the colleges based on the same formula that the State allocates funds to community college districts. The colleges now determine how to allocate these funds to all its instructional, student and support services.

Under the new SB361 allocation model, the college president approved the replacement of 6 full-time faculty retirements for fall, 2010, in spite of the 7.9 percent total college budget reduction for the 2010-11 academic year. For fall 2010, there were 113 full-time faculty.

The tentative 2011-2012 budget required a further budget reduction of at least 9.1 percent in the total college allocation and a corresponding 8-12 percent reduction in the academic year class schedule. In spite of these required budget and class schedule reductions, the college president approved 4 full-time faculty replacements for 2011-2012 academic year. It is anticipated that for fall 2011, there will be a total of 115 full-time faculty, although late retirements could change that figure.

Therefore, since the time this self-study recommendation was made, the college has increased its full-time faculty by 7.5 percent, as represented in the following table. When funds to the college increase, the college now has authority on its own to further increase its number of full-time faculty.

<b>Fall Semester:</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Full-Time Faculty Headcount	107	110	114	113	115
Change vs. Prior Year	--	+2.8%	+3.6%	-0.9%	+1.8%
Change vs. 2007	--	+2.8%	+6.5%	+5.6%	+7.5%

**III.A.4.b Under the leadership of the director of business services, the college will work with the District Equal Opportunity and Diversity Advisory Committee to develop the diversity plan; it will then form its own diversity committee to implement the plan at the college level by June 2009.**

The development of the college Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan has been on hold while the district and campus waits for further direction and data from the State Chancellor's Office. During the 2010-11 academic year, the district-wide committee (EEODAC) did not meet. Given the budget crisis in the state, this issue appears to be on the back burner and we do not anticipate additional direction from the district in the short term.

Since 2008, members of the IDEA Committee have served on EEODAC and have worked on campus-based initiatives, such as improving our campus climate and culture through the work with Center for Urban Education, the Student Equity Plan and professional development opportunities.

Despite the lack of direction from the state, the IDEA Committee, as charged by Shared Governance Council, will work with District Human Resources during the fall 2011 semester to establish a campus EEO committee, based on the recommended structure outlined in the CCCCDD EEO Advisory Committee Procedures and Objectives. IDEA will also update LMC's EEO plan. The plan will provide mechanisms to monitor diversity in hiring, to train hiring committees, to ensure that LMC is following the state EEO guidelines, and to continue to nurture a culture of inclusion, tolerance and appreciation for diversity. Training on these issues can happen regardless of a state model/plan. The IDEA Committee will also collaborate with Professional Development Advisory Committee to provide supporting professional development opportunities.

**III.A.5.b. Under the direction of the college president, the college will adopt, implement and evaluate its newly redesigned professional development programs.**

A Professional Development Advisory Task was formed in April, 2008, and met through February, 2009. During that time it created a professional development (PD) mission, values, outcomes and guidelines and operational procedures. This information was reported to the Shared Governance Council (SGC) in a May, 2009, report, *Recommendation for PD Program at LMC*. SGC and the college president approved the report.

During February, 2010, the task force transitioned to the shared governance Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC). This committee, staffed by the Office of College Advancement, is comprised of representatives from faculty, classified staff, managers and students and meets monthly to fulfill the charges assigned by SGC. The committee reports to SGC annually; it reported in February 2011 for the first time.

The committee recommends a budget (funded by the college and the district office) which is approved by the president. PDAC uses the LMC “disaggregated” results of a district-wide PD survey to lead its planning efforts.

There are six standing PD committees, with membership from PDAC, as well as additional members from outside of the committee. The committee agreed that themes of Student Success and Assessment would weave through all PD activities. PDAC is working closely with the Planning Committee to integrate information about PD needs and activities through the program review process.

The six standing committees are:

- Teaching and Learning
  - Semester-long faculty support networks have been established
- Technology
  - Workshops regarding current and emerging technologies are presented
- Leadership and Organizational Development
  - A series of six workshops were held in spring 2011
  - A semester-long Leadership Academy (for 12 participants) has begun in fall, 2011
- Health and Wellness
  - Workshops and activities for all faculty and staff
- Conference Approval Committee
- The Local Planning Group (LPG)
  - Approves and organizes Flex activities, per the United Faculty contract
  - Chaired by the Senior Dean of Instruction with membership of faculty and managers from PDAC, plus two additional faculty members.

Sub-committees are formed as necessary. Members of PDAC also connect with all other committees on campus to learn of their PD needs.

In terms of evaluation, one of the “guiding principles” of the professional development program is to “integrate evaluation and assessment into the design of all professional development activities.” This principle has been implemented as follows:

- All PD activities include expected learning outcomes for participants.
- An evaluation is completed by all participants at the conclusion of all PD activities. The 10-question evaluation asks respondents to rate the activity on how it met expectations, on the overall quality and on how it met the identified learning outcomes.
- PDAC uses the results of the evaluations in order to improve activities and for planning purposes.
- PDAC reports annually to the SGC, which includes a self-evaluation component.

### **III.B.1 The President's Office will coordinate the development and review of options for a new Brentwood Center.**

Under the leadership of the former college president, LMC has made great strides in moving toward a permanent location for its Brentwood Center.

For the past 10 years, the center has been located in space that is leased from the City of Brentwood. While the remodeled supermarket space has served the college well; even with recently added space, it is now at capacity. Therefore, for the past several years, LMC has aggressively pursued a permanent site for the center.

Such a center will provide educational opportunities to the rapidly-growing communities in the eastern portion of LMC's service area. As growth in the area continues, cities such as Brentwood and Oakley, are being transformed into highly populated suburban communities. The permanent outreach center will relieve pressures on LMC and provide a more efficient and traffic-sensitive solution for providing programs and services to residents of the area.

During early 2011, the college district purchased 17 acres on the south side of Brentwood, on which it will eventually build a permanent center. At its November 2010 meeting, the Governing Board amended the 2006 Measure Bond Project list to authorize expenditure of \$4.8 million in local bond funds to purchase the property; accepted the planning report for the property; and authorized the actual purchase of the land.

The project proposes construction of a new education center that will eventually serve 5,000 full- and part-time students. The center will offer general education and developmental curriculum, with a limited number of career technical programs. Two 44,000 square-foot buildings are planned for the site, which will house classrooms, laboratories and administrative and faculty offices.

During summer of 2011, the district submitted a "final project proposal" to the state for construction of the permanent center. Application for official center status will be submitted during 2011-12.

**IV.A.2 The college president and Shared Governance Council will develop and implement a plan to promote employee engagement with institutional governance processes during the 2008-09 academic year.**

The Shared Governance Council (SGC) took a more proactive role in the direction of each of the shared governance committees during 2008-09. Time was spent reviewing the purpose of each committee; then, using the Master Plan goals as a guide, the SGC developed specific goals (charges) for each of the committees. SGC members shared this information with each of their constituent groups -- Academic Senate, Associated Students, Classified Senate, and Management Council – in order to identify appropriate representatives for each committee. Through this process of developing clear and specific committee goals and intentional committee recruitment, engagement in the governance process improved.

During fall, 2009, the SGC began the practice of hosting a retreat each semester to address various governance processes and issues. During fall '09 and spring '10 the retreats, which involved SGC members and several additional students, faculty, staff and managers, reviewed each of LMC's planning processes and documents to understand how to best coordinate and integrate planning on campus. During fall '10, the retreat brought over 40 campus stakeholders together to identify issues around campus climate and to begin to identify strategies to address the identified issues. In spring '11, the retreat brought governance representatives together to review progress on accreditation responses and self-study recommendations and to develop a plan to increase employee engagement in governance and other groups and committees.

**IV.B.1.b. The Board will develop metrics by which to monitor educational programs. It will also update and promulgate a districtwide strategic plan and complete a workforce development plan.**

The Governing Board monitors educational programs through the District Educational Policy Committee (EPC), which was established by Board Policy 4008. The policy requires the committee to meet at least annually “to discuss the review, establishment, modification and discontinuance of courses and program for each of the colleges.”

At the college level, program review is the mechanism to monitor the quality of its educational and student services programs. As mandated by board policy, the review process is conducted every five years, with annual updates required each fall. While the process is slightly different at each college, the policy requires “both quantitative and qualitative elements and should assist programs in developing and articulating a vision for promoting academic excellence.” It goes on to mandate that the review be “based on appropriate core data, i.e. enrollment trends, and should relate to college planning processes and lead to better utilization of existing resources and increased quality of instruction and service.”

Each fall each college reports a summary of program review results to the EPC, including the requirement to list programs identified as “in trouble” based on program review or enrollment management issues. LMC has had no “in trouble” programs in recent years.

During spring 2011, the District’s Strategic Plan was updated using a participatory process involving all constituencies, under the leadership of LMC’s retired vice president.

**IV.B.3.b. Under the leadership of the college president, LMC will evaluate the District's new administrative structure for efficiency and effectiveness.**

The LMC management team regularly informally evaluates the District's services to the college – to its employees and to its students. The college president periodically takes information to the Chancellor's Cabinet for discussion and follow up.

Partially as a result of cabinet discussions, during spring 2011, the chancellor redesigned the District's administrative structure, with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness. Major changes focused on the roles/responsibilities of the now three vice chancellors and their divisions. Implementation began during summer 2011. The college will continue its informal evaluation of District services once implementation is complete.

LMC also has active representatives on the District Governance Council (DGC), which provides input and feedback on District services. During 2010-11, the DGC was chaired by an LMC faculty member.

During spring 2011, the District also conducted an extensive employee survey that focused on governance and decision making. Of 167 respondents to the survey, 37 were from LMC. The open-ended responses to the questions included feedback on some issues involving efficiency and effectiveness. Survey results are being analyzed and will be used to improve services.

**IV.B.2.c. Under the leadership of the college vice president, the college will evaluate the District’s hourly teaching budget formulas in terms of adequacy in supporting the effective operations of the colleges and propose modifications, as needed.**

Since the completion of the Institutional Self Study in 2008, the college has made great strides in fully funding the hourly teaching budget, in spite of significant overall budget reductions for the District and the college.

The college was successful in working with the District Office to revise the hourly teaching budget to correct the major flaw in the model. Historically, the budget model ignored the college average hours per full-time faculty equivalent. It had assumed that all faculty are assigned a full-time equivalent workload of 15 hours per week, based on the lecture mode of instruction. Los Medanos College has traditionally scheduled a significant number of sections with the laboratory mode of instruction, thus increasing the average hours per full-time faculty equivalent to 16.36 hours per week. This flaw had resulted in the college significantly overspending the hourly teaching budget in spite of the productivity (FTES/FTEF) it had achieved, as compared to the agreed-upon productivity goal.

Beginning in fiscal year 2009-10, the District revised the budget model to incorporate the actual college average hours of full-time instructors per full-time faculty equivalent. With this new allocation methodology resulting in a more realistic budget based on FTES goals and productivity, Los Medanos College was successful in keeping spending well within its hourly teaching budget based on improved college productivity for the first time since the inception of the flawed hourly teaching budget methodology. All previous fiscal years, the college's spending had significantly exceeded the hourly teaching budget, in spite of achieving the budgeted productivity, as represented in the following table:

Fiscal Year:	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Goal Productivity	16.4	16.5	16.7	18.0
Actual Productivity	15.0	16.4	18.1	18.4
Budget Under/(Over) Spent	\$(1,251,969)	\$(850,557)	\$522,257	\$85,394

Based on one of the recommendations from the Accrediting Commission, the District developed a new financial allocation model based on the State SB361 model. It was implemented for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This model allocates operating funds to the colleges based on the same formula the State allocates funds to the colleges. Now the college itself determines how to allocate these funds to all its instructional, student and support services.

This new allocation methodology has provided Los Medanos College full authority to determine what level of funds to allocate to instructional costs. With this new authority, the college has further improved the hourly teaching budget to properly incorporate the projected instruction from full-time faculty in order to correctly project the instructional budget for part-time faculty, in order to achieve the college FTES and productivity goals. The projected instruction from full-time faculty now accurately projects the budget impact of other variables, such as reassigned time, grant-funded instruction and banked load. This new approach allows the college to

accurately budget and track its instructional costs. The hourly teaching budget projections for fiscal year 2010-11 presented above reflect these improvements.

**IV.B.2.g. The District will develop mechanisms for regularly evaluating role delineation and governance and decision-making structures, and make improvements, such as increasing participation in district governance, based on the evaluation results.**

Processes to regularly evaluate role delineation and governance and decision-making structures were codified in Board Policy 1012, revised January 26, 2011, and Administrative Procedure 1012.01, adopted November 23, 2010, both titled Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, Assessment and Continuous Improvement. They indicate:

Board Policy 1012

*The Chancellor shall establish and implement regular cycles of review for assessing the effectiveness of (1) the District's administrative organization and (2) the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the District and the colleges, and (3) the District governance and decision-making processes.*

Administrative Procedure 1012.01

*District governance and decision-making processes shall be evaluated every three years and the results used as a basis for improving the processes. At a minimum, all persons who serve in leadership positions at the District level and all who serve on District committees shall participate in the evaluation process.*

Evaluating Role Delineation

The District Office implemented a Department/Unit Review process, whereby each department will complete its first review within a two-year period, beginning 2009-10. An essential element of this review is a "...delineation of District and college roles, responsibilities, service outcomes" – accomplished through the collaborative process of the District Office department/unit manager and the corresponding college unit in completing this evaluation, review, and update of the District's "Delineation of District and College Roles, Responsibilities, and Service Outcomes" document.

Evaluating Governance and Decision-Making Structures

A "District-Level Governance and Decision-Making Assessment" survey was developed through the District Governance Council (DGC) and was first administered during spring 2011. The summary of the results was 18 pages -- it provided a wealth of information and comments, disaggregated by location. The results are currently being reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet and by the DGC.