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Sample: Academic Unit Planning

Strategic Plan
Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the College review and revise as necessary the current instructional program review process for effectiveness in improving instructional programs based on District/College institutional research data (no program self-developed data) and that a key measure of program success be its response to discipline, cluster, and College developed SLOs. The team recommends that the review process should be completed with sufficient time to allow confirmation that the College has an operational and sustainable instructional review process as evidenced by completed program review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. Further, the College program review policy and procedures should reflect the key and decisive role of the administration of the College in decisions effecting scheduling of courses and the continuance/discontinuance of programs (1B, 1B1, 1B3, 1B4, 1B5, 1B6, 1B7, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2f, IIA6b, IVB2).

Response:
The most current signed agreement of the Program Review and Policy and Procedures Manual (hereafter referred to as the 2003 PRPP Manual) was approved by the Academic Senate and the College Planning Action Council (CPC) and is dated October 16, 2003. The actions taken as a result of the accreditation recommendations are described in the response that follows.

The first part of Recommendation 1 deals with reviewing and revising as necessary the current instructional program review process and the use of District/College institutional research data (no program self-developed data). The issue of using District/College institutional research data and not self-developed data is found in both Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 2. The source of data in program review is discussed in greater detail in the response to Recommendation 2.

The Academic Senate convened the Academic Senate Review Network (ASPRN) in 2006 and charged this group with evaluating each of the academic program review documents on the college website and presenting these evaluations to the division chairs for further action. ASPRN’s report of August 2006 identified some common areas of improvement over the program review and unit planning templates previously used, including: 1. the recommendations that program review include a team approach: Administrators, faculty, staff, students and the community; 2. the reviews include quantitative and qualitative data analyses to support findings of program strengths and weakness; and 3. the reviews strengthen the connection between data analyzed and student needs with program plans. The June 7, 2007, ASPRN report to the Academic Senate reported on this group’s effort to combine the two program review manuals previously approved by the College Planning Council (CPC) and the President. The goal of this task was to match more closely the language of the documents with the accreditation standards as currently written. Continuous dialogue between the Academic Senate and the Administration regarding revisions to the Program Review and Policies and Procedures is ongoing.
A part of Recommendation 2 deals with the timeliness of the review process to allow confirmation that the college has an operational and sustainable instructional review process as evidenced by completed review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. The Academic Senate Program Review Committee developed a template entitled *Program Review Report Feedback*, read the program reviews submitted for accreditation, and provided evaluative feedback on the instructional program reviews. The template for Behavioral Sciences dated May 2006 is included as an example.

The last part of Recommendation 1 states, “College program review policy and procedures should reflect the key and decisive role of the administration of the College in decisions effecting scheduling of courses and the continuance/discontinuance of programs.” The Administration has a key and decisive role as delineated in Board Rules, Title 5, the AFT 1521 Agreement, and the 2003 *Program Review and Policy and Procedures Manual* dated October 16, 2003 (the most recent signed agreement between College President Linda Spink and Senate President Susan McMurray).

This 2003 *PRPP Manual* and the Board Rules currently numbered as 6800, 6801, 6802, 6803 and 6803.10 are listed under their former numbers in the 2003 *PRPP Manual* (6708, 6709, 6710, 6711 and 6711.10). These Board Rules deal with the following:

- 6800 Course and Program Approval and Modification
- 6801 Program Review
- 6802 Vocational Program Biennial Review
- 6803 Viability Review
- 6803.10 Program Termination

The signed *PRPP Manual* includes a definition of an academic program as well as the procedures for Program Initiation and Program Revitalization or Discontinuance. New programs and the courses involved in the proposed new program must be recommended by the Curriculum Committee and approved by the Academic Senate and College President.

Program revitalization or discontinuance begins when the program review process indicates a program no longer successfully serves the purpose for which it was intended. Such findings for possible program discontinuance begin with the program revitalization process and formation of a Program Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the PR Committee) charged with the responsibility of devising a plan to modify the program and submitting its findings to the Academic Senate and College President for approval.

If the PR Committee finds the program no longer fulfills the college mission and goals or is prohibitively expensive pursuant to Board Rules 6711 Viability Review and 6711.10 Program Termination, Education Code 78015, and Title 5, CCR, 51022(a), the PR Committee may recommend to the Academic Senate that the program be discontinued. The Board Rule on Program Termination states, “The College President and College Academic Senate President shall make program discontinuance recommendations to the
Board of Trustees for approval. The recommendation shall include a description of the viability review process and the reasons for the recommendation.”

With respect to a key and decisive role of the administration in effecting scheduling of courses, Article 12 Sections A through H of the AFT Local 1521 Agreement clearly state the role of the administration in fulfilling Article 12 of the contract. Article 12A states the departmental goal of maintaining an average class size of 34 at the first census, and Article 12B lists the conditions under which the average class size shall be reduced; the College President or designee has an unambiguous role in making recommendations under Part 3 of this Article 12B. Articles 12C, 12D, 12E, 12F and 12G clearly state the consultative and decisive role of the appropriate administrator and the faculty involved in scheduling. Depending on the section involved, either the College President or Vice President of Academic Affairs represents the administration in the discussion. Likewise, the faculty is represented by the Department Chair and/or AFT Chapter Chair in discussing the various conditions of class size and low enrollment courses. The sections of Article 12 and the content covered include:

- **12A** Goal of 34 average class size
- **12B** Conditions for reduction of average class size below 34
- **12C** President approves Departments exempted from average class size
- **12D** President ensures reasonable and consistent compliance of Article 12
- **12E** President or designee consults with the Department Chair to establish limits in excess of goal of 34 average class size
- **12F** Cancellation of class rests with the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) or designee and the Department Chair or faculty member involved
- **12G** Conditions for cancellation of an “advanced class” VPAA or designee. Consultation shall involve the President or designee, the AFT Chapter, and the Academic Senate to determine “advanced classes” in this section.
- **12H** Right of Departments exceeding class size goals to schedule within parameters and scheduling of classes by the VPAA or designee in departments that do not meet the class size goal of 34 as stated in 12A.

In terms of scheduling courses, Article 12 of the AFT Agreement clearly states the roles of the administration, whether the President or VPAA.

**Appendix**

Board Rules ARTICLE VIII EDUCATIONAL COURSES AND PROGRAMS 6800, 6801, 6802, 6803, 6803.10
AFT Bargaining Agreement Article 12 Sections A through H
Academic Senate Review Network Report to the Academic Senate August, 2006
Academic Senate Review Network Report to the Academic Senate June 7, 2007
Recommendation 2: The College needs to develop an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. This should be based in deep analysis of District and institutional research provided data and assure a broad involvement and participation in the institutional planning cycle (1B1).

Response:
Harbor College has a cycle of academic program review whereby disciplines within departments/divisions have been placed on a regular, six-year cycle that includes each discipline doing an intensive review that takes up to two years to complete. The Division Chairpersons (Chairs) are charged with the responsibility of completing the academic program reviews for the disciplines within their jurisdictions. The Chairs requested that a template be developed that encompasses the criteria of integrated planning, resource and budget planning, implementation, and regular evaluation. The Academic Affairs Committee, co-chaired by James Stanbery and Luis Rosas, began the process of developing the template for Chairs to use in their systematic program review process.

Ultimately, the Academic Affairs Committee adopted two templates in January 2008, and the Chairs have begun the process of using the templates for program review and unit planning within their divisions. One template involves a narrative format of describing the program and the other uses a spreadsheet format to summarize the data and statistical analysis of the courses offered and the program SLOs fulfilled by the courses. Course enrollment, student achievement, successful course completion, budgeting, census data, and cost analysis are among the factors that can be analyzed on the spreadsheet. Dr. Bob Richards provides the data from the District Office of Institutional Research needed to analyze the factors ultimately determined as most useful for program review and unit planning. Several Chairs started the process of using the templates to analyze their programs at the discipline level during the 2008 winter break.

As required under Recommendation 1 that the College “use Institutional/College (no program self-developed data),” all data and statistics used to complete the templates for program review are extracted from the District Office of Institutional Research. This office generates the data used to compile the Los Angeles Harbor College Fact Book and Planning Resource Guide (Fact Book) that is updated, published, and distributed annually. The process of carrying out the statistical analysis for program review is based on data compiled by and/or from the Office of Institutional Research. The Department of Institutional Research provides the statistical analysis requested by Division Chairs and discipline faculty. Divisions and disciplines within divisions may determine which data elements are relevant and required for analyzing and completing their program reviews and division plans.

The major data elements of the Fact Book include:
- Student Demographics and Enrollment Data
- Special Populations
- Efficiency by Divisions summarized as a five-year snapshot in the categories of: WSCH
FTEF
WSCH/FTEF
Class Size
Performance and Outcomes
   Degrees and Certificates
   Retention Rates by Department
   Successful Completion Rates by Department
Performance and Outcomes
   Grade Distribution
   Student Right to Know
   Transfers to California Public 4-Year Institutions
   Assessment Placement Summary
   Student Survey Results
Faculty and Staff
   Headcount Distribution (EEOS)
   Headcount and FTE by Classification
   Full-time Equivalent Faculty
   Faculty Demographics
   Classified Demographics
Budget and Finance
   Unrestricted General Fund by
      Sub-Major Commitment Item
      Major Activity
      Expenditures by Major Object
      Expenditures per Enrollment and FTES
      Major Object Expenditure Comparison
Others
   Restricted General Fund Appropriations
   Allocation Base Revenue—Small Campuses
   Allocation Base Revenue—Large Campuses
   Growth Revenue Calculation
Planning
   Strategic Master Plan 2005-2007
   Environmental Trends
      National and State Economic Forecast
      Regional Economic Forecast
      Los Angeles Economic Forecast
      The South Bay
         Economic forecast
         Top Ten Business Stories
         Median Home Prices
         Cost of Living Index
         Population and Household
         Ethnicity
         Age
         Educational Attainment
Household Income
Port of Los Angeles

Appendix

*Los Angeles Harbor College Fact Book and Planning Resource Guide*
January 2008 Unit Planning Template
January 2008 Program Review Course and Statistical Analysis
**Recommendation 3:** Using the planning process and the governance process, the College should construct a meaningful dialogue about student learning which assures understanding and infusion of Student Learning Outcomes at program and certificate levels as well as course and institutional levels. This dialogue should rely on robust information focused on the accomplishments of students as defined in program, inter-departmental, and institutional student learning outcomes. (1B3, 1B5, 1B6, 1B7).

**Response:**
Harbor College is in the process of hiring a SLO Faculty Co-Coordinator with 0.2 reassigned time. The SLO Faculty Co-Coordinator will be selected early in the Spring, 2008 semester and is charged with the following duties and responsibilities:

- Attending District SLO Coordinators meetings
- Providing leadership and support to the academic divisions in developing and assessing student learning outcomes
- Assisting with the maintenance of SLO Assessment sites on Études
- Helping to plan and present any SLO training for faculty
- Assisting in record keeping and writing SLO reports to the appropriate bodies (e.g., WASC)

In Fall 2007 the Curriculum Committee at Harbor College adopted the Los Angeles Community College District Course Outline Template used by all other colleges in the District. The district course outline template calls for the use of Bloom’s Taxonomy to state student learning outcomes (SLOs). These measurable terms are used to assess and evaluate whether or not the course SLOs are achieved. Student learning outcomes at the course level are continually written and/or revised on a regular basis as course outlines are updated during their six-year cycle. The templates for the program reviews adopted in January 2008 allow Division Chairs and/or discipline faculty to continue writing SLOs at the program level. (See attached Unit Plan and Activity Summary Sheets and *Draft Outcomes Assessment Plan: Beginning the Dialog* for development of full assessment cycle and integration into college planning process.)

The two SLO Co-Coordinators work with the Flex Committee and Academic Senate to provide ongoing workshops and training on writing measurable SLOs that can be assessed using qualitative and quantitative criteria.

**Appendix**
- SLO Faculty Co-Coordination Position Announcement: Duties and Responsibilities
- Los Angeles Community Colleges District Course Outline
- *Draft Outcomes Assessment Plan: Beginning the Dialog*
- Unit Plan and Activity Summary Sheets
Recommendation 4: In making public the process of program review as well as the results, the College will regularly and in a timely manner review and update policy, planning and procedures manuals (1B3, 1B5, 1B6, 1B7).

Response:
As stated in the response to Recommendation 1, the Academic Senate Review Network (ASPRN) met in 2006-2007 and developed a 2007 draft revision of the Program Review and Policy and Procedures Manual (2007 PRPP) that was approved by the Senate and submitted to the College President. This revised 2007 PRPP Manual included in the appendix a list of programs by discipline and division along with the program review schedule by disciplines over a three-year period. Since the 2007 PRPP revision was not accepted by the College President, the current signed 2003 PRPP Manual remains in force.

In addition, the Senate and Administration “will regularly and in a timely manner review and update policy, planning, and procedures manuals through the Senate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee.” During the development of the integrated unit planning and program view templates in 2007, the Chairs expressed a willingness to complete the task of planning and program review. However, they voiced a strong preference that whatever template is finally adopted that it be used consistently for a reasonable period of time until accreditation standards change or the template is deemed no longer to meet the needs of the college.

In terms of making public the process and results of program review, the Accreditation Self-Study Report is on the college web site. The program reviews are accessible online. The Board Rules cited in the responses are on the Los Angeles Community College website and can be accessed by the public. Likewise, the AFT Agreement and the Articles cited on class size are available on the AFT’s website. The Senate plans to place the most recent versions of signed agreements between the Senate and the College President on the Harbor College website.

Appendix
January 2008 Unit Planning Template
January 2008 Program Review Course and Statistical Analysis
Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the district evaluate the impact of the revenue allocation model and consider the special conditions of individual colleges (Standards III.D, IV.B).

Response:
The district has responded to this recommendation by adopting a new budget allocation model in January 2007, detailed in the District Budget Committee (DBC) Report of the Budget Allocation Task Force (1.1). Several activities led up to the adoption of the new allocation model.

In the spring of 2006, in response to ACCJC concerns, the district engaged a third party consultant, Michael Hill, to review the district’s current budget allocation and funding mechanisms. In particular, studies were conducted to answer the question of whether the model contained inherent disadvantages for the small colleges in the district. In addition, they dealt with the issue of consistent overspending of the budget at Harbor College. Mr. Hill issued his first report in October 2006 (1.1 Appendix B).

Among his findings were that the district should move quickly to implement the new funding formula established by SB 361, adjust the allocation model to make assessments on a cost per FTES basis, and consider conducting assessments differently. The report also made some specific suggestions to Harbor College to reduce costs and improve productivity. His second report, the “LACCD Small College Economy of Scale Analysis,” issued November 2006, looked at the adequacy of the new state formula’s foundation allocation of $3 million (1.1 Appendix C). The Chancellor’s Cabinet reviewed and discussed the studies in the Fall of 2006.

In late October 2006, the DBC discussed the studies, and acting on the recommendation of then-Chancellor Rocky Young, agreed to form a Budget Allocation Task Force consisting of two members of each of the DBC stakeholder groups (1.2). The task force was charged with the job of reviewing the district model and developing a new funding formula to provide sufficient funding for college operations. Included on the task force were representatives of both small and large colleges, including Jack E. Daniels III, the president of Los Angeles Southwest College, and Lauren McKenzie, faculty member from Los Angeles Harbor College. The DBC also issued a report on the planning and development of the new budget allocation model, including a timeline for completion (1.3).

The task force thoroughly discussed the findings contained in the independent studies, particularly focusing on issues of compliance and alignment with the state funding model. In January 2007, the task force issued its recommendations for the adoption of a new budget allocation model in order to bring the internal budget formula into alignment with SB 361, the new CCC funding formula. The LACCD model exactly parallels the state budget formula, allocating funds to the colleges on a credit FTES basis with a two tiered basis for noncredit. One change from the state model was an increase from contingency reserves of $500,000 (above the $3 million state allotment) in basic allocations for each of the district’s four smallest colleges (Harbor, Mission, Southwest, and West) in order to offset the problems that small colleges face in meeting their costs. The task
force also recommended that districtwide assessments be changed from a percentage of college revenue over total district revenue to a cost per FTES basis since the use of FTES is consistent with the way all other funding decisions are made. The purpose of changing this manner of distributing the charge for services was to make the system more equitable and effective. This turned out to be a healthy change that benefited all the small colleges in 2006-07. The task force further suggested that the district office budget allocation not be set at a fixed percentage and that its budget be periodically reviewed for appropriateness. (Details of the recommendations are contained in the report.)

The DBC approved the new budget allocation model on January 17, 2007 (1.4) and the Board of Trustees approved it on February 7, 2007 (1.5). The new model addresses the concerns regarding disparity in the treatment of the smaller colleges, noted by the ACCJC. However, as of Fall 2007, six district colleges project potential budget shortfalls. These are expected to be mitigated by growth funds as they become available in the Spring of 2008. In addition, the district is working with the colleges on enrollment management strategies for 2008-09 to bring their budgets under control.

As has been the practice in the district since 2001, when the DBC instituted allocation grant procedures in response to the situation of smaller colleges that have had trouble balancing their budgets, a college ending the year in deficit can request the intervention of the DBC Allocation Grant Taskforce, comprised of administrators, faculty, and staff from other colleges in the district. To apply for debt relief, the college submits a fiscal self-study to assess the causes of its deficit. Members of the taskforce review the data, visit the college, meet with administrators, faculty, and staff, and issue recommendations to help the college reach financial independence. If the college follows these recommendations, a portion of the deficit is offset with funds from the district’s contingency reserve. Southwest College underwent the process in 2001-02, Harbor College in 2003-04, and Mission College in 2007. In Spring 2007, the DBC decided that a college that ends the year in deficit for more than $500,000 or 1% of its budget (whichever is greater) is required to submit a financial plan and participate in a quarterly review.

Evidence
(Evidence for District Recommendation on CD)

* Appendix B  Report to Chancellor Young, LACCD, On Specific Matters Related to District Operations, Michael Hill, October 5, 2006
* Appendix C  LACCD Small College Economy of Scale Analysis, November 2006
DBC minutes October 25, 2006
** Budget Allocation Model Planning and Development report, October 25, 2006
DBC minutes, January 17, 2007
Board of Trustees minutes, February 7, 2007
* Note: Appendix B, Appendix C are part of the Report of the Budget Allocation Task Force.
** Note: Budget allocation Model Planning and Development Report, 10/25/06, can be found at: https://albacore.laccd.edu/fis/budget_dev/documents/ImplementationofSB361NewCCCFCourningFormula_000.pdf
Recommendation 6: The functional relationship between the College and District needs to be fully defined through a dialog focused on efficient use of resources and service to students. The implementation of a decentralized relationship needs mutual definition. (IV.B.3.a, c)

Response:
Since the LACCD Board of Trustees formally adopted the principle of decentralization in 1999, the district and the colleges have been working to clarify and delineate operational responsibilities. Eight years ago, the district participated in a pilot program organized by the ACCJC aimed at clarifying lines of accountability and authority in districts with multiple colleges. Known as the Multi-College Pilot Program (MCPP), this effort involved members of accreditation committees, who, with input from district administration, the board, the academic senate, and union leadership, examined district/college roles and responsibilities. Meetings led to the creation of a 45-page functional map, which was revised several times over the years (2.1). The map delineated whether functions outlined in accreditation standards belonged to the district, the nine colleges, or a district-wide body.

In order to respond to ACCJC concerns that the Functional Map’s primary focus was in relation to the accreditation standards and did not provide a clear delineation of operational responsibilities and functions, in 2005 the district initiated a review of all district office functions. Over a two-year period, every district office charted the functions it provides to the colleges. The functional map was replaced with District Office Service Outcomes, specifying user constituencies at the college level, areas of responsibility, and expected outcomes for all services (2.2). These service outcomes were shared with the Chancellor’s Cabinet and the three vice presidents’ councils to elicit feedback. Further dialogue took place at the annual District Academic Senate summit in September 2006, a day-long event attended by 125 Academic Senate faculty leaders and senior staff from all nine colleges. A panel comprised of the chancellor, a member of the Board of Trustees, the president of the District Academic Senate (DAS), a faculty union representative, and a college president explored the current state of decentralization and district/college relations with attendees. Breakouts afforded participants a chance to go more in depth to discuss specific areas, such as payroll, HR, and marketing (2.3).

Another opportunity to engage in dialogue related to district/college relationships and functions was launched in the Spring of 2006, when the district initiated the District Strategic Planning Initiative. This comprehensive district-wide strategic planning process gave the colleges a chance to assess progress made toward achieving past goals as detailed in district self studies and informal planning activities and to establish new districtwide goals and objectives. Informal SWOT analysis focus groups were held at each college that semester. Participants identified district-wide strengths and weaknesses and suggested future priorities (2.4). A draft of the District Strategic Plan 2006-2011 (2.5) was circulated in Fall 2006, discussed in open forums held on the campuses and at the annual DAS summit, and received final approval by the Board of Trustees in January 2007. Strategic Plan Goal #4 deals with efforts to develop a districtwide culture of service and accountability, which entails maximizing the ability of the colleges to act
efficiently as independent entities while simultaneously enjoying the benefits of being a large, multi-college district. The short-term and long-term outcome measures of effectiveness for the plan’s goals and objectives are outlined in the implementation matrix (2.6). As part of its response to this planning goal, the district has created an HR Help Desk to assist employees with Human Resources issues that are not solvable at the campus level (2.7) and is in the process of creating an Employee Service Center to assist the district’s employees with payroll, benefits, retirement, and other personnel matters.

In a continuing effort to clarify district/college responsibilities, the district, in conjunction with the AFT College Faculty Guild, began holding annual Department Chair Workshops in the fall (2.8). The first one was held in October 2006, the second in November 2007. Over 100 department chairs and vice presidents of Academic Affairs attended the first session to learn the ins and outs of district and campus roles related to the vital function of running the colleges’ academic departments.

To further clarify functions, the District Office departments have begun a pilot project to create flow charts of districtwide functions, both on the district and college levels. The goal is to create simple, intuitive visual process maps of critical functions, such as faculty and staff hiring, curriculum approval, procurement, specially funded programs, faculty and staff evaluations, etc. These functional flow charts will delineate responsibilities between the colleges and the District Office for each step of the process being described. The eventual goal is to post these online with links to forms and contact information. The Faculty Hiring Flow Chart is a sample of the charts that are being developed (2.9). The district is finalizing its review of functional flow charts for the Diversity Programs Office, Human Resources, Budget, Accounting (including accounts payable), Business Services and Educational Support. These should be completed by the end of February 2008. Customer Satisfaction Surveys are being developed for each of these offices, with a target completion date of March 2008. After the flow charts are developed, by the spring of 2008, they will be forwarded to the vice presidents’ councils and the DAS for review and refinement as a final step in the comprehensive dialogue of the past two years.

Our new chancellor, Mark Drummond, has also made a commitment to redefining decentralization as it impacts the district’s efficiency and effectiveness. Beginning this spring, the chancellor will engage the Board of Trustees, the Cabinet, the District Academic Senate, and the colleges in an ongoing dialogue to further clarify decentralization and district/college relationships. This dialogue will include the mutual creation of a decentralization “vision statement” that will be integrated into the current District Strategic Plan. When finalized, this vision statement will be circulated among district and college stakeholders for review and will be submitted to the Board of Trustees for adoption by June 2008.

Evidence
(Evidence for District Recommendations on CD)

  Functional Map
  District Office Service Outcomes
DAS Summit 2006 agenda, DAS newsletter article, minutes
SWOT results from the three Seaside colleges, Spring 2006
District Strategic Plan
Strategic Plan Implementation Matrix
HR Help Desk flyer
Department Chair workshops
Faculty Hiring Flow Chart
This is the Final Draft agreed upon by President Spink, Senate President June Smith, Vice President Luis Rosas and Beverly Shue that was reviewed, revised and approved by the Academic Senate on 2/7/08.
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APPENDIX

SLO (Student Learning Outcomes) for 2008
SLO Faculty Co-Coordinator
Duties and Responsibilities

SLO Faculty Co-coordinator will work with the administrative co-coordinator to implement the processes and procedures at the college for assessing student learning outcomes. Representative activities and duties will include:

- Attending the District SLO Coordinators meetings
- Provide leadership and support to the academic divisions in developing and assessing student learning outcomes
- Assist with the maintenance of the SLO Assessment site on Études
- Help plan and present any SLO training for faculty
- Assist in record-keeping and writing SLO reports to the appropriate bodies (e.g., WASC).

Reassigned time: .2
Draft Outcomes Assessment Plan: Beginning the Dialog

Academic Affairs Cluster / CPC
Los Angeles Harbor College

December 12, 2007
Foreword

Since its inception in September of 1949, Los Angeles Harbor College has consistently offered an environment that fosters learning by providing comprehensive programs that meet the educational needs of students that are appropriate and useful to the community we serve. It has had as a stated goal the offering of “innovative, state-of-the-art, learner-centered instruction in all Harbor College programs” and the promotion of “effective learning.” Over the years Harbor faculty have consistently and rigorously examined both the curriculum and their teaching to provide their students with the best learning environment.

The inclusion of the new standards for the assessment of student learning outcomes merely provides a more systematized opportunity for improving both curriculum and instruction across the College. This analysis of student learning outcomes is at the heart of the instructional mission of the College and should help to direct the allocation of resources and shape the educational master plan.

Assumptions about the Assessment Program at LA Harbor College

There are certain conditions for the establishment of a sound, effective assessment program at LA Harbor:

1.) There must be significant faculty involvement in determining the items to be assessed and the form of the evaluation.
2.) Any assessment program must be an on-going program and not a single effort to meet outside pressures. The cycle of institutional effectiveness must be established and institutionalized.
3.) The goal of the assessment program will be continuous improvement of educational quality at LAHC. "The point is what the Western Association of Schools and Colleges calls (in its assessment requirement) 'a culture of evidence,' in which questions about educational effectiveness and standards are routinely addressed, discussed, and acted upon. . . . . In the words of one administrator, 'assessment is an iterative function, where modest things matter over time" (Hutchings, Marchese, and Wright 3).
Measurement of outcomes is a very important part of the process of improvement. Since this will be an on-going and continuous effort, it need not be comprehensive at the start, but should show clear signs of development toward a comprehensive assessment program.
4.) Our approach to assessment does not assume that there must be added layers of standardized instruments; rather, we assume that in some instances a discipline may meet the WASC requirement by strengthening existing forms of assessment (for example, outside licensure, agreement on grading standards, etc.) or by exploring a variety of ancillary assessment measures.
Assessment versus Evaluation:

There has been a great deal of discussion relative to assessment and evaluation here at Los Angeles Harbor College. For the purpose of this discussion the term evaluation will be used to refer to the process of determining whether an individual student has met the requirements of the course. It should be thought of as the process of gate keeping or grading. The term student outcomes assessment refers to an analysis of how effectively students are meeting academic program expectations as defined by the faculty. The results of the assessment program should be used to enable those responsible for academic programs to determine what works and what does not work in order to develop, redesign, and implement plans to continuous improvement. The student outcomes assessment program is different from program review, but much of the data collected in the two distinct programs can be used in both.

The results of the student outcomes assessment program should not be used to evaluate individual students or faculty. When care is not taken to distinguish between student outcomes assessment and individual faculty evaluation, there is the potential that the student outcomes assessment process may be compromised as faculty might become more concerned with their own evaluation rather than with program evaluation. There is, however, the responsibility of faculty to participate in the assessment of student learning outcomes at both the course, program, and institutional levels. (See the appendix “Recommendations for the Incorporation of Student Learning Outcomes in Faculty Evaluation” from the LACCD Faculty Evaluation Task Force.)

Although some measures used in classroom evaluation may be used in outcomes assessment and vice versa, a conscious effort must be made to maintain the integrity of the two programs.

It should be noted that consideration must be given to all these programs as one attempts to determine how effectively the institution as a whole is meeting its mission.

WASC Standard II:

The institution offers high quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

A. Instructional Programs

The institution offers high quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education
institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

   a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

   b. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.

   c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.1.2

   a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

   b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

   c. High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.
d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.

3. The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it, including the following:

a. An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

b. A capability to be a productive individual and life long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critic

c. A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles;
civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline.

   a. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

   b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

   c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

7 In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.
a. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

b. The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.

c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

8. Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with standards and applicable Commission policies.

Institutional Learning Outcomes:

It is easy to see that there are learning outcomes unique to an individual class session, a course, or program. There are, however, learning outcomes at the institutional level. Los Angeles Harbor College is a community college, and as such, reflects the needs and interests of a wide variety of students. Some are attending with the intent to transfer to a four-year institution, some are seeking vocational skills and employability, some are attending for reasons of personal fulfillment. Institutional learning outcomes are those outcomes that we expect regardless of the student’s motivation or length of stay at the institution.

On the first face of it, the institutional learning outcomes will look very much like the general education requirements for all students receiving the associate of arts degree. Harbor College has identified the following general education requirements:

- the ability to think and to communicate clearly and effectively both orally and in writing;
- the ability to use mathematics;
- the ability to understand the modes of inquiry of the major disciplines;
- the ability to be aware of other cultures and times;
- the ability to achieve insights gained through experience in thinking about ethical problems
- the ability to develop the capacity for self-understanding.

There will, no doubt, be overlap between the institutional learning outcomes and the general education requirements. However, the institutional learning outcomes include the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes that students are expected to develop as a result of their overall experiences with any aspect of the college, including courses, programs, and student services. LA Harbor has identified the following as its Institutional Learning Outcomes:
Effective Communication Skills: to interpret content, compose thoughts, ideas and information, to articulate clearly, to develop critical listening and appropriate responses

Critical Thinking and Problem-solving: to understand inquiry, demonstrate flexible thinking, differentiate facts from opinions and emotions, use evidence and reasoning, analyze and solve numerical concepts

Appreciation of Cultural Diversity, Global Awareness, and Aesthetics: to show tolerance and respect for cultural diversity, understand cultural significance, recognize global interdependence, appreciate how the arts enrich human experience

Personal, Professional and Civic Responsibility: clear sense of self, respect, honesty and integrity, assess one's ability, take responsibility for realistic goal setting and actions, plan for well-being and success, make ethical decisions, demonstrate professional values, implement successful plans, work effectively with others, meet deadlines, adapt to change, participate and contribute to the community

Information Management and Technological Competence: identify and define information and use appropriate information resources to match needs. Evaluate and apply relevant, valid and reliable information. Understand implications and use appropriate technology applications

The College makes certain that these outcomes are addressed in the courses it offers across the curriculum. See the table below for the ILOs and the courses in the English curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Effective Communication Skills</th>
<th>Critical Thinking and Problem-solving</th>
<th>Appreciation of Cultural Diversity, Global Awareness, and Aesthetics</th>
<th>Personal, Professional and Civic Responsibility</th>
<th>Information Management and Technological Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng 21: English Fundamentals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 28: Intermediate Reading and Composition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 30: Reading for Pleasure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 31: Composition and Critical Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 33: Basic Vocabulary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 67: Writing Laboratory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 73: Beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Reading &amp; Writing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 101: College Reading &amp; Composition I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 102: College Reading &amp; Composition II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 127: Creative Writing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 137: Library Research &amp; Bibliography</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng 203: World Literature I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes at the Course and Program Levels:**

There should be a direct correlation between the measured outcomes at the course and program levels with the Institutional Learning Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAOT 110</strong> provides an overview of presentation design principles. Uses PowerPoint software to create presentations incorporating templates, fonts, graphics, transitions, sound, and animation. Upon successful completion of this core student should be able to do the following:</td>
<td>Plan a presentation considering the audience, content, and method of delivery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Windows to manage storage devices and folders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the function of basic Microsoft Office features</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a new presentation using a template</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert slides with slide layout</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And edit or delete comments in a presentation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reporting of Assessment Results: Completing the Cycle

The assessment of student learning outcomes is not merely a one-time event; it is an iterative process over time in which small changes make a significant difference. The analysis of these results provides a climate of evidence for the improvement of instruction. The form on the following page provides a consistent means of reporting the results of these assessments across the college.

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges has made it very clear in the wording of Standard Two that assessment does not end with a collection of data or even its analysis. The accrediting agency requires evidence that the data be used for the improvement of student learning. Once the data have been collected, they must be fed back into the institutional processes which support the educational endeavor: the budget process, the faculty hiring process, and equipment prioritization process. It should find a rightful place not only in program review but in the individual unit plans. Please see the model on page following the form.

The college should create a central repository in the Office of Academic Affairs to house the assessment results and analysis for each discipline. This central repository will facilitate reporting to the Western Association Schools and Colleges as required in the accreditation standards.

**Time Line for Accreditation - Instructional Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Accreditation team visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Final edit of accreditation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Gather documentation and write responses to accreditation standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’09-‘10</td>
<td>Begin program assessment and continue course assessment based on developed calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete the writing of degree/certificate outcomes for publication of 10-12 catalog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’08-‘09</td>
<td>Department – retreats to design program outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop institution-wide calendar for course/program assessment (department driven)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report course assessment results; embed results in unit plans and program reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Services Assessment

Perhaps the key question asked of student affairs personnel might be expressed as follows: “Of those students who use the services, programs and facilities, is there any effect on their learning, development, academic success, or other intended outcomes, particularly when compared to non-users?” It is important to note that not all outcomes of interest to student services are learning outcomes; many pertain to the timely, efficient, and effective delivery of services.

To the extent that student affairs practitioners are equating student learning as student development is seen as both a process and a set of desired outcomes. The conceptual underpinnings of many student development assessment tools may be traced to one of four categories of models about the development process.

*Psychosocial theories* describe how individuals resolve challenges and personal growth issues at different stages during the life cycle. Work by A. Chickering on “vectors of development” maybe the best-known writing.

*Cognitive structural theories* describe the processes by which people move from fairly simplistic, dualistic judgments and reasoning ability to more competition, reflective understandings when needs and abilities and constructions of reality. The writing of W. Perry and M. Baxter-Magolda represent this assessment tradition.

*Personal-environment interaction theories* describe the ways individual performance can be optimized when needs and abilities are congruent with the demands of the environment. This perspective helps explain why some students find certain institutional environments compatible and others do not. The writing of these authors does not describe developmental processes or outcomes. Prominent writers in this stream of thinking include A. Astin and E. Pascarella and P. Terenzini.

*Typology models* sort individuals into categories based upon similarities and differences relative to how they manage common developmental tasks inherent in the collegiate
setting. Inventories such as the Myers-Briggs and Kolb's work fall into this assessment effort. Another aspect of this category is the writing of authors who are looking at process indicators representing the extent to which students engage in the activities that predict desired learning and personal development outcomes. Works by R. Pace, A. Chickering and Z. Gamson, or G. Kuh fall into this group.

Source:

Other good sources:


Helpful web sites are:
[http://www.uncc.edu/stuaffairs/sar/](http://www.uncc.edu/stuaffairs/sar/)
[http://wbarratt.indstate.edu/dragon/home.htm](http://wbarratt.indstate.edu/dragon/home.htm)

These resources deal less with assessment, but make the case for learning in the context of student services programming.


LA HARBOR COLLEGE  
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Assessment Report (DRAFT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department: ___________________________</th>
<th>Discipline/Program: __________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by: __________________________, Academic Dean</td>
<td>Date: __________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach additional pages as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Mission &amp; Goals</th>
<th>Course/Program/ILO Intended Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Summary of Data Collected</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the mission and goals served by the learning outcome</td>
<td>Identify here the course, program, or institutional learning outcome to be measured.</td>
<td>Show here what measures were used to assess students’ learning. It may be a quantitative or qualitative measure. You should also indicate multiple measures used.</td>
<td>Show in this column the results of the assessment and your analysis of the data.</td>
<td>Show in this column how the analysis of the assessment is being used to improve instruction. This may include recommendations for resources, changes in course outlines, changes in pedagogy, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate of continuous assessment, adjustment, improvement.
Appendix C:

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Assessment Report

Department: Communications  
Course/Discipline/Program: Speech 101

Reviewed by: ____________________________, Academic Dean  
Date: ____________________________

Attach additional pages as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Mission &amp; Goals</th>
<th>Discipline/Program Intended Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Summary of Data Collected</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication Skills: to interpret content, compose thoughts, ideas and information, to articulate clearly, to develop critical listening and appropriate responses</td>
<td>Students will have knowledge of communication theory and have the ability to: Identify terms Define terms Apply terms</td>
<td>Examinations: embedded questions on four key terms. 80% success in identifying all four key terms.</td>
<td>Students scored 65% in getting all four.</td>
<td>Revise teaching to emphasize concept of audience analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be able to select appropriate communication behaviors</td>
<td>Oral assignments</td>
<td>Based on five-point rubric, 80% of students were able to identify and select appropriate communication behaviors</td>
<td>No changes were necessary at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Recommendations for the Incorporation of Student Learning Outcomes in Faculty Evaluations
August 16, 2006

Since the adoption of the new accreditation standards, the question of the proper role of student learning outcomes in the faculty evaluation process has emerged in relation to several District college accreditation self study efforts. The ACCJC’s new standards make clear that accreditors expect student learning outcomes to play a role in faculty evaluations:

"Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes."

Standard III. A. 1. c.

Understandably, faculty members have been concerned about the potential misuse of SLO assessment in relation to individual faculty evaluations. Clearly, it would be unfair to hold individual instructors accountable for aspects of student learning that range well beyond their control—things like varying levels of student preparation, motivation, work load, family situation and other factors that impact an individual’s ability or willingness to learn. It would also be impractical—if not impossible—to assess the learning of every student in every section on a regular basis.

To address this issue, in Spring 2006 the AFT and the District Academic Senate created a special Faculty Evaluation Taskforce to offer District colleges guidance on how to address this new ACCJC mandate. After reviewing the AFT collective bargaining agreement and consulting with the ACCJC, the Taskforce is forwarding the following recommendations to the colleges for consideration:

I. There appears to be room within the provisions of Articles 19 and 42—without need for revision—for the inclusion of consideration of student learning outcomes. This is possible because Articles 19 and 42 specify that evaluation committees will determine the data and information to be
gathered in support of the comprehensive evaluation process.

2. Colleges are encouraged to engage faculty in an institution-dialogue on how to address the inclusion of student learning outcomes within the parameters established by Article 19. As a matter of faculty professional concern, this process should be overseen by the college Academic Senate in consultation with the AFT Faculty Guild Chapter.

3. One of many possible approaches to the effective incorporation of student learning outcomes in faculty evaluations might involve linking comprehensive evaluations to the long-term professional development goals of individual faculty. (See the attached "Proposed Model") This approach would help to "close the loop" of institutional improvement, by linking faculty development activities to college-wide efforts to improve student learning outcomes.

Ultimately, because accreditation is a college-specific process, the colleges themselves must address this issue through a vigorous process of collegial dialogue and debate. It is expected that this collaborative district-wide discussion will improve the faculty evaluation process and underscore our colleges' commitment to excellence and student success.

**Joint AFT/DAS Faculty Evaluation Taskforce**

**Members:**

Dana Cohen, LACC Academic Senate President

Gary Colombo, Chancellor's Liaison

Paul Doose, LASC Academic Senate

Chini Johnson-Taylor, LA TIC Academic Senate President

Sandra Lee, LASC AFT Chapter President

Leon Marzillier, District Academic Senate President
Gary Prostak, LAMC AFT Chapter President
Olga Shewfelt, WLAC AFT Chapter President
Don Sparks, AFT Local 1521
Joanne Waddell, LA VC AFT Chapter President
Mark Wood, LAHC Academic Senate
Accountability
The demand by a community (public officials, employers, and taxpayers) for school officials to prove that money invested in education has led to measurable learning. “Accountability testing” is an attempt to sample what students have learned, or how well teachers have taught, and/or the effectiveness of a school’s principal’s performance as an instructional leader. School budgets and personnel promotions, compensation, and awards may be affected. Most school districts make this kind of assessment public; it can affect policy and public perception of the effectiveness of taxpayer-supported schools and be the basis for comparison among schools.

Accountability is often viewed as an important factor in educational reform. An assessment system connected to accountability can help identify the needs of schools so the resources can be equitably distributed. In this context, accountability assessment can include such indicators as equity, competency of teaching staff, physical infrastructure, curriculum, class size, instructional methods, and existence of tracking, number of higher cost students, dropout rates, and parental involvement as well as student test scores. It has been suggested that test scores analyzed in a disaggregated format can help identify instructional problems and point to potential solutions.

Alternative Assessment
Many educators prefer the description “assessment alternatives” to describe alternatives to traditional, standardized, norm- or criterion-referenced traditional paper and pencil testing. An alternative assessment might require students to answer an open-ended question, work out a solution to a problem, perform a demonstration of a skill, or in some way produce work rather than select an answer from choices on a sheet of paper. Portfolios and instructor observation of students are also alternative forms of assessment.

Analytic Scoring
A type of rubric scoring that separates the whole into categories of criteria that are examined one at a time. Student writing, for example, might be scored on the basis of grammar, organization, and clarity of ideas. As a diagnostic tool, an analytic scale is useful when there are several dimensions on which the piece of work will be evaluated. (See Rubric.)

Assessment Task
An illustrative task or performance opportunity that closely targets defined instructional aims, allowing students to demonstrate their progress and capabilities.

Authentic Assessment
Evaluation by asking for the behavior the learning is intended to produce. The concept of model, practice, feedback in which students know what excellent
performance is and are guided to practice an entire concept rather than bits and pieces in preparation for eventual understanding. A variety of techniques can be employed in authentic assessment. The goal of j2e authentic assessment is to gather evidence that students can use knowledge effectively and be able to critique their own efforts. Authentic tests can be viewed as “assessments of enablement,” in William Glasser’s words, ideally mirroring and measuring.

Capstone or Senior Project
Extensive projects planned and carried out during the last year of college as the culmination of the college experience. Capstone projects require higher-level thinking skills, problem-solving, and creative thinking. They are often interdisciplinary and may require extensive re-search. Projects culminate in a presentation of the project to a panel of people, usually faculty and community mentors, sometimes students, who evaluate the student’s work at the end of the year.

Evaluation
Both qualitative descriptions of pupil behavior plus value judgments concerning the desirability of that behavior. Using collected information (assessments) to make informed decisions about (at Harbor College) an individual student’s performance and hence grade.

Formative Assessment
Observations which allow one to determine the degree to which students know or are able to do a given learning task, and which identifies the part of the task that the student does not know or is unable to do. Outcomes suggest future steps for teaching and learning. (See Summative Assessment.)

Holistic Method
In assessment, assigning a single score based on an overall assessment of performance rather than by scoring or analyzing dimensions individually. The product is considered to be more than the sum of its parts and so the quality of a final product or performance is evaluated rather than the process or dimension of performance. A holistic scoring rubric might combine a number of elements on a single scale. Focused holistic scoring may be used to evaluate a limited portion of a learner’s performance.

Metacognition
The knowledge of one’s own thinking processes and strategies, and the ability to consciously reflect and act on the knowledge of cognition to modify those processes and strategies.

Multi-Dimensional Assessment
Assessment that gathers information about a broad spectrum of abilities and skills (as in Howard Gardner’s theory of Multiple Intelligences).
Outcome
An operationally defined educational goal, usually a culminating activity, product, or performance that can be measured.

Output
Objective data about the students and the course that are most typically found in the college Fact Book. The data include statistics on gender, reading scores, economic level, graduation rates, FTES, etc. Outputs usually point to opportunities for the college to add programs etc. Outcomes usually point to ways the faculty can improve instruction in a course or program.

Performance-Based Assessment
Direct, systematic observation and rating of student performance of an educational objective, often an ongoing observation over a period of time and typically involving the creation of products. The assessment may be a continuing interaction between teacher and student and should ideally be a part of the learning process. The assessment should be a real-world performance with relevance to the student and learning community. Assessment of the performance is done using a rubric, or analytic scoring guide to aid in objectivity. Performance-based assessment is a test of the ability to apply knowledge in a real-life setting. Performance of exemplary tasks is the demonstration of intellectual ability.

Performance Criteria
The standard by which student performance is evaluated. Performance criteria help assessors maintain objectivity and provide students with important information about expectations, giving them a target or goal to strive for.

Portfolio
A systematic and organized collection of a student’s work that exhibits to others the direct evidence of a student’s efforts, achievements, and progress over a period of time. The collection should involve the student in selection of its contents, and should include information about the performance criteria, the rubric or criteria for judging merit, and evidence of student self-reflection or evaluation. It should include representative work, providing a documentation of the learner’s performance and a basis for evaluation of the student’s progress. Portfolios may include a variety of demonstrations of learning and have been gathered in the form of a physical collection of materials, videos, CD-ROMS, reflective journals, etc.

Portfolio Assessment
Portfolios may be assessed in a variety of ways. Each piece may be individually scored, or the portfolio might be assessed merely for the presence of required pieces, or a holistic scoring process might be used and an evaluation made on the basis of an overall impression of the student’s collected work. It is common that assessors work together to establish consensus of standards or to ensure greater reliability in evaluation of student work. Established criteria are often used by reviewers and
students involved in the process of evaluating progress and achievement of objectives.

Product
The tangible and stable result of a performance or task. An assessment is made of student performance-based on evaluation of the product of a demonstration of learning.

Project
A complex assignment involving more than one type of activity and production. Projects can take a variety of forms. Some examples are a mural construction, a shared service project, or other collaborative or individual effort.

Rating Scale
A scale based on descriptive words or phrases that indicate performance levels. Qualities of a performance are described (e.g., advanced, intermediate, novice) in order to designate a level of achievement. The scale may be used with rubrics or descriptions of each level of performance.

Rubric
Some of the definitions of rubric are contradictory. In general, a rubric is a scoring guide used in subjective assessments. A rubric implies that a rule defining the criteria of an assessment system is followed in evaluation. A rubric can be an explicit description of performance characteristics corresponding to a point on a rating scale. A scoring rubric makes explicit expected qualities of performance on a rating scale or the definition of a single point on a scale.

Scoring Criteria
Rules for assigning a score or the dimensions of proficiency in performance used to describe a student’s response to a task. May include rating scales, checklists, answer keys, and other scoring tools in a subjective assessment situation, a rubric.

Scoring Guide
A package of guidelines intended for people scoring performance. May include instructions for rating, rating scales, and samples of student work illustrating performance levels.

Self-Assessment
A process in which a student engages in a systematic review of a performance, usually for the purpose of improvement. May involve comparison with standard, established criteria, critiquing one’s own work, or a description of the performance. Reflection, self-evaluation, and metacognition are related terms.

Summative Assessment
Evaluation at the conclusion of a unit or units of instruction or an activity or plan to determine or judge student skills and knowledge or effectiveness of a plan or activity. Outcomes are the culmination of a teaching/learning process for a unit, subject, or year’s study. (See Formative Assessment.)

Taken from several sources including:
Assessment: How Do We Know What They Know? ASCD.
SCASS Arts and Assessment Project Glossary of Assessment Terms.
Wiggins, Grant. Glossary of Useful Terms Related to Authentic and Performance Assessments.
A True Test: Toward a More Authentic and Equitable Assessment. Phi Delta Kappan, 5/89. 703-713.
Wolf, Dennis Palmer. Assessment as an Episode of Learning.
Working Definitions for Assessment Technology.
Assessment References


Marzano, Robert, and John S. Kendall. Designing Standard-Based Districts, Schools, and Classrooms. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, 1996.
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Article VIII: Board Rules on Educational Courses and Programs
ARTICLE VIII

EDUCATIONAL COURSES AND PROGRAMS

6800. COURSE AND PROGRAM APPROVAL AND MODIFICATION. The Chancellor, in consultation with the District Academic Senate, shall develop policies for the establishment and modification of courses and programs.

Title 5, CCR, 51022(a)

Adopted 06-11-03

6801. PROGRAM REVIEW.

1. The purposes of educational program review include:
   
a. Defining and affirming excellent academic programs;
b. Providing for a systematic program planning process;
c. Reviewing the quality of instructional programs and courses;
d. Fostering self-renewal and self-study of programs.

2. Program review shall link the college’s mission with the educational master plan, and department goals and educational objectives.

3. Each college shall, in consultation with its Academic Senate, develop policies and procedures for the review of all “educational programs”, as defined in Title 5, section 55000(b). At a minimum, this review will consider the following:

   a. MISSION – the relationship of the program to the mission of the college and the District;
b. NEED – the need for the program;
c. QUALITY – the overall quality of the program;
d. FEASIBILITY – the feasibility of offering the program; and
   e. COMPLIANCE – the compliance of the program with all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

Adopted 06-11-03
VOCAATIONAL PROGRAM BIENNIAL REVIEW. In addition to the program review standards, criteria, policies and procedures established pursuant to Board Rule 6801, each college’s vocational or occupational training programs (i.e., degrees or certificates with TOP codes identified as “vocational” in the Chancellor’s Office Taxonomy of Programs) shall be subject to a biennial review. This review of vocational programs shall determine whether the following conditions or criteria are met:

1. The program meets a documented labor market demand;
2. The program does not represent an unnecessary duplication of other vocational or occupational training programs in the area; and
3. The program is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and/or completion success of its students.

This review of each of the college’s vocational or occupational training programs shall be scheduled once every two years, and shall include a review and comments from a local Workforce Investment Board. The college shall make written summaries of its biennial review findings available to the public.

Upon completion of the required biennial review of vocational programs, the college’s President and the Academic Senate President shall certify that the vocational programs reviewed meet the criteria listed above and forward this certification to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will then present to the Board of Trustees, as an information item, a list of programs reviewed and certified as meeting the requirements of Education Code section 78016.

If a College President and college Academic Senate determine that a program does not meet the above requirements, the college shall conduct a viability review in accordance with the procedures established under Board Rule 6803. The purpose of a viability review is to determine what measures, if any, should be taken to improve the program. If the program fails to meet the requirements of Education Code section 78016 and this Board Rule, the college shall, in keeping with the provisions of Board Rule 6803.10, consider the program’s termination.

EC 78016

Adopted 06-11-03
VIABILITY REVIEW. In addition to procedures for program review established pursuant to Board Rule 6801, each college shall, in consultation with its Academic Senate, develop procedures for initiating and conducting a viability review of “educational programs,” as defined in Title 5, section 55000(b).

A program viability review may be conducted when the college determines, in accordance to procedures developed pursuant to this Board Rule, that an in-depth analysis, beyond that provided through program review, is necessary.

At a minimum the viability review procedures shall contain the following:

1. A definition of a viability review, which shall include, at a minimum; the current need for the program, the feasibility of continued support for the program, and expected program outcomes;
2. The factors that will trigger a viability review;
3. Identification of the individuals (by title) and college constituencies included in the process;
4. Procedures and criteria for information gathering;
5. Processes for conducting the review;
6. Procedures and rationale for developing recommendations, including program maintenance, modification or discontinuance.

Possible outcomes of a viability review may include, but are not limited to, recommendations on the following:

1. Program modification;
2. Program improvement;
3. Departmental reorganization;
4. Program initiation;
5. Program discontinuance.

Adopted 06-11-03

6803.10 Program Termination. In making a recommendation for program discontinuance, a viability review must consider the following:

1. The effects on students and student success if the program is discontinued;

Adopted 06-11-03
2. Provisions that can and should be made for students in progress to complete their training;
3. The impact that discontinuance of the program will have on the comprehensiveness and balance of offerings across the college curriculum and within the district;
4. How the program’s discontinuance would impact the educational and budget-planning process used at the institution;
5. How the program’s discontinuance affects the region;
6. The effects of the program’s discontinuance on transfer to four-year colleges and universities;
7. The effects of the program’s discontinuance on local business and industries;
8. The effects of the program’s discontinuance on faculty and staff.

The College President and College Academic Senate President shall make program discontinuance recommendations to the Board of Trustees for approval. The recommendation shall include a description of the viability review process and the reasons for the recommendation.

EC 78016, Title 5, CCR, 51022(a)

Adopted 06-11-03
APPENDIX

Article 12: AFT Bargaining Agreement on Class Size
AGREEMENT

Between the Los Angeles Community College District

and the

Los Angeles College Faculty Guild

Local 1521, CFT/AFT, AFT/CIO

July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2008

ARTICLE 12, CLASS SIZE

A. Each department shall, as a goal, maintain an average class size of 34 students at the first census. In no way is this goal intended as a device for calculations related to a reduction of class offerings. Class offerings are determined by an array of data including but not limited to student demand, articulation agreements, graduation requirements, facility limitations, equipment limitations and others.

B. The average class size shall be reduced if:

1. State or Federal laws or regulations or accrediting agencies such as that for Allied Health (or Nursing) restrict the teacher-student ratio for classes offered by the department, or

2. The facilities of the department or number of work stations, or where equipment, supervision or safety requirements restrict the size of the classes, or

3. The Chancellor grants an exception based upon the recommendation of the College President or his/her designee.

C. Departments exempted from the average class size under Section B.2. shall have their new average class size approved by the College President in consultation with the AFT Chapter Chair. This information shall be provided to the AFT and the Office of Academic Affairs.

D. To ensure compliance with this Article, the President must take such steps as are reasonable and consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

E. The President or his/her designee, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall establish class section enrollment limits in excess of the average class size to ensure compliance with this Article and provide the information to the Office of Academic Affairs.
F. Responsibility for canceling classes because of low enrollment or low attendance shall rest with the Vice President of Academic Affairs or his or her designee, after consultation with the Department Chair or the faculty member involved, whenever reasonably possible. Except as provided in Section G, the Vice President may cancel a class for low enrollment at any time before the first class session if the number of students enrolled is fewer than fifteen. Similarly, the Vice President may cancel the class for low attendance at any time during the first two weeks of a standard academic semester (or the first 10% of the term-length for a class scheduled for a period that is shorter than a standard academic semester) if the number of students actually attending is fewer than fifteen.

G. The Vice President of Academic Affairs or his or her designee may cancel an "advanced class" for low enrollment at any time before the first class session if the number of students enrolled is fewer than eight. Similarly, the Vice President may cancel an "advanced class" for low attendance at any time during the first two weeks of a standard academic semester (or the first 10% of the term-length for a class scheduled for a period that is shorter than a standard academic semester) if the number of students actually attending is fewer than eight. The President, or his or her designee, and the AFT Chapter shall, after consulting with the college Academic Senate, determine which classes are "advanced classes" subject to this section.

H. Departments currently meeting or exceeding class size goals have the right to schedule their own classes within reasonable parameters established by the Vice President of Academic Affairs, or his or her designee, in consultation with the Department Chair. (Examples of such parameters include, but are not limited to, the need to strike an appropriate balance between day and evening class offerings, and the need to coordinate schedules among departments, where appropriate). Scheduling in departments not meeting class size goals shall be done with the approval of the Vice President of Academic Affairs or his/her designee.
APPENDIX

Los Angeles Community Colleges
Course Outline
LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE COURSE OUTLINE

☐ Associate Degree Applicable Course

☐ Non Associate Degree Applicable Course

TOP CODE:

☐ NEW Course

☐ ADDITION of a District Course

☐ Revision/Update Date:

☐ Distributive Learning

☐ Curr. Committee Date:

1. DEPARTMENT/DISCIPLINE:

2. SUBJECT:

3. COURSE TITLE:

SUBJECT CODE:

COURSE NUMBER/LETTER:

4. HOURS PER WEEK: Lecture hrs. Lab hrs. Discussion hrs

Other: (Specify) total hrs/wk UNITS:

5. REPEATABILITY: ☐ None ☐ RPT1 ☐ RPT2 ☐ RPT3

6. PREREQUISITE AND/OR CO-REQUISITE:

7. COURSE CATALOG DESCRIPTION: (Please limit to 50 words)

8. COURSE CLASSIFICATION / ARTICULATION:

Course Classification Requested:

Approved/Date/Signature:

☐ Acceptable for Credit, University of California ☐ ☐

☐ Acceptable for Credit, California State Universities ☐ ☐

☐ Baccalaureate ☐ ☐

☐ Occupational ☐ ☐

☐ Pre-college level, prerequisite and/or Developmental
9. TEXTBOOKS: (List all publications required for the course, and recommended college level readings) (Also required for courses offered in a Distributive Learning format in order to be transferable.)

Author, Title, Publisher, Edition/Year:

10. MATERIALS and SUPPLIES: List materials and supplies REQUIRED for this course. For Distributive Learning courses: Students are required to have a personal E-mail address and Internet access through a private provider.

COLLEGE PROVIDED:

STUDENT PROVIDED:

☐ Not Applicable

11. ENTRY SKILLS: Objectives must be written clearly and concisely, using action verbs (see Blooms Taxonomy on page 8) for cognitive (thinking) learning, or psychomotor verbs (performance) for skills

THE STUDENT IS ABLE TO:

12. SCANS Indicate the SCANS competencies developed in this course:

Resources (Identifies, organizes, and allocates resources.)
☐ Time ☐ Money ☐ Material and Facilities ☐ Human Resources

Information (Acquires and uses information.)
☐ Acquires/Evaluates ☐ Organizes/Maintains ☐ Interprets/Communicates ☐ Uses Computers

Technology (Works with a variety of technologies.)
☐ Selects ☐ Applies to tasks ☐ Maintains and troubleshoots equipment
**Thinking Skills**
- Creative Thinking
- Decision Making
- Problem Solving
- Symbolic Thinking
- Application of learning techniques
- Reasoning

**Interpersonal** (Works with others.)
- Serves as team member
- teaches others
- Serves clients/customers
- Exercises Leadership
- Negotiates
- Works with diversity

**Systems** (Understands complex inter-relationships.)
- Understands systems
- Monitors/corrects systems
- Improves/designs systems

**Fundamentals**
- Reading
- Writing
- Mathematics
- Listening
- Speaking

**Personal Qualities**
- Responsibility
- Self Esteem
- Sociability
- Self Management
- Integrity

13. **INSTRUCTIONAL METHODOLOGY:** (Recommended types of writing assignments, demonstrated use of symbol systems or ability to apply skills learned in the course) (For Distributed Learning courses: Description of “asynchronous interactivity”, i.e. ability to receive instruction at a different time than class is offered.)

**A. WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>req.</th>
<th>opt.</th>
<th>req.</th>
<th>opt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail/Bulletin Boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summaries &amp; Analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Internet/Chat Rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (____)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. SYMBOL SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>req.</th>
<th>opt.</th>
<th>req.</th>
<th>opt.</th>
<th>req.</th>
<th>opt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting/Graphics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. SKILLS**
14. APPROPRIATE OUTSIDE ASSIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Other (____)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. CRITICAL THINKING ASSIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Class Research</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Syntheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Analyses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Comparing and Contrasting</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Comprehension of Subject Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Evaluating Significance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Creating/Formulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Setting Up Proofs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Other (____)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. INSTRUCTIONAL MODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Term Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Lecture/Discussion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Oral Drills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Lecture/Laboratory</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Work Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Computer Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Guided Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Written Assignments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Discussion/Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Reading Assignments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Independent/Directed Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Mediated TV</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>One-on-one Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>TV/Audio Visual</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Digitized/Modem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>ISDN/CODEC (Videoconference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Small Group Experience</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Internet Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Field Experience</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Other (____)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Other (____)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. COURSE CONTENT

Please outline by topics or activities and include time schedule in hours.
Distributive-Learning courses: Allocation of time may [or may not] be consistent
with traditional course hours/weeks. It will vary from student to student. See
approved course outlines for examples.
Objectives must written clearly and concisely, using action verbs (see Bloom’s
Taxonomy on page 8) for cognitive (thinking) learning, or psychomotor verbs
(performance) for skills.
Visit the website [http://nerds.unl.edu/pages/preser/sec/articles/blooms.html](http://nerds.unl.edu/pages/preser/sec/articles/blooms.html) for a
comprehensive breakdown of Bloom’s Taxonomy

| Topic or Activity | Time Allocated In hours | Objective/Exit Skills: As a result of completing this course,
THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Carnegie Rule and Title 5 section 55002 sets forth the minimum standards which require 1 hour lecture,
2 hours homework = 1 unit. Two hours per week of lab with homework = 1 unit,
3 hours of lab per week without homework = 1 unit. Lecture also includes discussion and/or demonstration hours, laboratory includes
activity and/or studio hours.

**State number of hours ( ) for activities.**

Use additional pages if necessary.

18. EVALUATION METHODS
(Multiple measures, which are consistent with the course objectives, content and scope, must be used to determine student’s final grade. Student performance will be evaluated by essay unless problem solving or skill demonstration is more appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Quizzes, Unit Tests, Midterms</td>
<td>☐ Essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Final Exam</td>
<td>☐ Term Papers, Projects and Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Laboratory Reports</td>
<td>☐ Homework Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Observation Record of Student Performance</td>
<td>☐ Oral Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Class Participation</td>
<td>☐ Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Written Compositions</td>
<td>☐ Standardized Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Collaborative Assignments</td>
<td>☐ Other ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For Distributive Learning courses: explain how testing will be accomplished, i.e., through U.S. mail, over E-mail, in on-campus testing center, at the LAC, or in designated classroom. When an in-person testing center or site is used, a picture ID will be required to verify student’s identity during testing or examination.)

19. COLLEGE LIBRARY MATERIALS ASSESSMENT:

The instructor and acquisitions librarian have evaluated the library materials relating to this course and noted relevant supporting materials and needs.

Acquisitions Librarian ________________________________
Date __________________

The above signature does not denote approval or disapproval of this course. Signature is not required for routine course revisions, which do not have substantive changes.

20. DISTRIBUTIVE LEARNING COURSES: COLLEGE READINESS

The instructor has consulted with the LAN Administrator and Distance Education Coordinator regarding needed support related to this course. This support may include use of college facilities, assistance in preparation of materials to be sent over the ISDN lines in digitized format, and provision for intellectual property rights of the instructor.

LAN Administrator ________________________________
Date __________________

Distance Education Coordinator ________________________________
Date __________________
The above signatures do not denote approval or disapproval of this course. Signatures are not required for routine course revisions that do not have substantive changes.

________________________________________________________________________
Prepared by                      Date

________________________________________________________________________
Division Chair                   Date

________________________________________________________________________
Curriculum Committee Chair       Date

________________________________________________________________________
V. P. Academic Affairs           Date
LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE
STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF CREDIT COURSES

Name of Course:
Using the Official Course Outline, please determine whether or not the above listed credit course meets the following standards and criteria required in Title 5, Part VI of the California Administrative Code, and which has been designated as appropriate to the Associate Degree. Place a mark (X) in the appropriate box. For courses applicable for an Associate Degree all criteria must be met. For courses NOT applicable for an Associate Degree only criteria marked with an (*) must be met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING CRITERION</th>
<th>MET</th>
<th>NOT MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* 1. Is recommended by the responsible college officials, and the academic senate or other appropriate faculty body as meeting the requirements of this subsection and has been approved by the local district governing board as a course meeting the needs of the students eligible for admission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 2. Is taught by a credentialed instructor in the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 3. Is offered as described in an outline in official college files. That outline shall specify the unit value, scope, objectives, and content in terms of a specified body of knowledge, appropriate reading and writing assignments, outside of class assignments, instructional methodology, and methods of evaluation for determining whether the stated objectives have been met by students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 4. Is taught in accordance with a set of instructional objectives common to all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 5a. Provides for measurement of student performance in terms of the stated course objectives and culminates in a formal recorded grade based upon uniform standards in accordance with Section 55758 of this part, which is permanently recorded as an evaluation of student performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Bases grades on demonstrated proficiency in subject matter determined by multiple measurements for evaluation; and has examinations, including essays and/or, where appropriate, uses appropriate symbol systems and/or skills demonstrations by students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 6a. Grants units of credit based upon a specified relationship between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours or performance criteria specified in the course outline.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Requires a minimum of three hours of work per week including class time for each unit of credit and prorated for short term, lab and activity courses.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RATING CRITERION</strong></th>
<th><strong>MET</strong></th>
<th><strong>NOT MET</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Treats subject matter with the scope and intensity, which requires students to study independently outside of class time.</strong></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 8. Requires, when appropriate, entrance skills and consequent prerequisites for the course before students are enrolled</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Requires as a pre- or co-requisite to enrollment in other courses throughout the degree and certificate curricula, eligibility for enrollment in associate degree credit courses in English and/or mathematics when language and/or computational skills at the associate degree level are deemed by the college and/or district curriculum committee as necessary for success in such courses.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Requires the ability to think critically and to understand and apply concepts in order to participate in the course.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Requires learning skills and vocabulary appropriate for a college course.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Requires the use of college level educational materials.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 13. Allows repeated enrollment only as permitted by provisions of Division 2 (commencing with Section 51000). Section 55781-55783 and 58161 of this part.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLEASE INDICATE THE DEPARTMENT’S PLAN FOR IMPROVING ANY STANDARD NOT PRESENTLY MET.

COURSE NOT APPROVED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON (S):

___________________________________________________

Curriculum Committee Chairperson

___________________________________________________

DATE

Bloom’s Taxonomy
Cognitive Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>define</td>
<td>translate</td>
<td>interpret</td>
<td>distinguish</td>
<td>compose</td>
<td>judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>restate</td>
<td>apply</td>
<td>analyze</td>
<td>appraise</td>
<td>appraise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>record</td>
<td>discuss</td>
<td>employ</td>
<td>differentiate</td>
<td>design</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list</td>
<td>describe</td>
<td>use</td>
<td>appraise</td>
<td>formulate</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recall</td>
<td>recognize</td>
<td>demonstrate</td>
<td>calculate</td>
<td>arrange</td>
<td>compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>explain</td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>experiment</td>
<td>assemble</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relate</td>
<td>identify</td>
<td>illustrate</td>
<td>test</td>
<td>collect</td>
<td>revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underline</td>
<td>locate</td>
<td>operate</td>
<td>compare</td>
<td>construct</td>
<td>score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report</td>
<td>schedule</td>
<td>contrast</td>
<td>create</td>
<td>select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review</td>
<td>shop</td>
<td>criticize</td>
<td>set up</td>
<td>choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tell</td>
<td>sketch</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>organize</td>
<td>assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inspect</td>
<td>prepare</td>
<td>estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debate</td>
<td></td>
<td>measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>solve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>examine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>categorize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Thinking
APPENDIX


Los Angeles Harbor College

Program Review Policy
and Procedure Manual

As approved by the Academic Senate and the college Planning Action Council October 16, 2003
PREAMBLE: All areas of the College are subject to Program Review. For the purpose of the review process each program will be defined as an area of the college with a distinctive cost center. These areas are not restricted to the Academic Affairs Cluster but include Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President's clusters as well.

All academic program and viability reviews will be guided by the Los Angeles District Board of Trustees rules 6708, 6709, 6710, and 6711, approved June 11, 2003, pursuant to Title 5, 5500(b), "and will consider: Mission, Need, Quality, Feasibility, and Compliance."

MISSION: The program review process provides all individual programs with an opportunity to formally review their goals and objectives in order to integrate these programs into the college master plan.

PURPOSE: The purpose of the review is to assess a program to determine how closely it actually meets its stated goals and objectives. The program evaluation process is designed to enable department members and other stakeholders to identify and evaluate the effectiveness of a program.

The purposes of educational program review include (Board Rule 6709.1):
   a) Defining and affirming excellent academic programs;
   b) Providing for a systematic program planning process;
   c) Reviewing the quality of instructional programs and courses;
   d) Fostering self-renewal and self-study of programs.

The purpose of viability review is to provide an opportunity for program modification, improvement, departmental reorganization, initiation, or discontinuance.

OUTCOME: The overall goal of the review process is to continually improve quality, as measured in context of the college's educational mission. It provides a formal assessment of a program as currently being implemented. The result will be specific objectives, budgets, and timelines for implementation.

Program Review Policy and Procedures Manual

Academic Program Review

DEFINITION OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM
An academic program is identified by the State Taxonomy of Programs [TOP] Code, or is a group of courses leading to a major, a certificate, or a degree. Some programs must perform program review for state or agency mandated requirements. Those programs do not need to duplicate these efforts; however, they do need to update unit plans as necessary.

PROGRAM INITIATION

There are many ways in which a new program may become an active component of the academic programs at Los Angeles Harbor College. New programs can be instituted by a department, or division, or by an interdisciplinary team of faculty that may also include administrators, students, and community representatives.

Any new academic course required by the program must be submitted to the Curriculum Committee and approved by the Academic Senate. These courses will be taught by an hourly instructor, full-time faculty's assignment, or overload. At the end of the second year as documented by unit plans and a new program evaluation, a Proposed New Program Request (PNPR) may be submitted to the college Curriculum Committee and approved by the Academic Senate. Until this time, no new permanent instructor or classified personnel can be hired exclusively for this program.

These procedures apply to stand alone academic programs as well as those incorporated in grants and specially funded programs.

Before becoming institutionalized, all programs must be approved by the Academic Senate and the College President.

PROGRAM REVITALIZATION OR DISCONTINUANCE

The program review process may indicate that a program no longer successfully serves the purpose for which it was intended. In such cases a program revitalization process will begin. This process is designed to modify, enhance, or modernize the program in order to allow it to continue.

A Program Revitalization Committee will be charged with the assignment of analyzing, evaluating, and recommending necessary changes to the program. The committee will be composed of all full-time and adjunct personnel in the program, division or department chair, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the dean responsible for the program, a faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate, a representative from the AFT (Instructional unit for academic programs), and a student representative appointed by the ASO.
This Committee is responsible for devising a plan to modify the program including expenses so that it meets the academic community needs and its budgetary constraints. Revitalization plans for academic needs will be submitted to the Academic Senate and President of the College for approval.

Program review and revitalization may determine that a program no longer fulfills the college mission and goals or is prohibitively expensive to revitalize (see Board Rules 6711 and 6711.10, and Education Code 78016, Title 5, CCR, 51022 (a). In such a case, the review committee may recommend to the Academic Senate that the program be discontinued.

If the Senate does not concur with the Program Review Committee's recommendation for discontinuance, the Senate President will call a joint meeting of the Program Review Committee and the Senate in order to reach consensus. However, if the Senate concurs, its recommendation and the final report from the Program Review Committee will be forwarded to the President.

The appeal process of the Faculty Hiring Policies Committee will be followed if the Academic Senate or President cannot come to mutual agreement.

**APPEALS**

In the event the College President does NOT approve the Academic Senate recommendations:

1. The College President will state in writing the reasons for the rejection to the Academic Senate President, the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee and to the AFT Chapter Chair according to the provisions of Article 33, and Board Rule 2.1.A.

2. The President's reasons for rejection will be made within (ten) 10 college business days after receiving the Academic Senate recommendations.

3. The Academic Senate will consider the President's written reasons and vote to accept or reject them.

**Filing the Appeal:**

1. If the Academic Senate votes to reject the disapproval, an appeal may be filed by the Recording Secretary of the Academic Senate with an Appeals Panel for final solution.

2. If the Secretary of the Academic Senate is a member of the Faculty, Hiring Priorities Committee, or a presenter, then the Academic Senate will elect a designee to file the appeal.
APPEALS PANEL

Composition of the Appeals Panel:

a. Academic Senate President  
b. Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee Chairperson  
c. Vice President of Academic Affairs  
d. AFT Representative if Article 33 is relevant

Designees:

In the event that the Academic Senate President is either a member of the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee or a presenter, the Academic Senate will elect a designee to sit on the Appeals Panel.

Procedure:

a. The Appeals Panel reviews and discusses the written rejection received from the College President.

b. The Appeals Panel prepares a written recommendation that is sent to the College President and to the President of the Academic Senate.

c. All parties will make every effort to reach a mutually acceptable agreement.
Program Review Process

The program review process will be under the direct supervision of the Division Chair or Manager responsible for the program. The Division Council will develop the Academic Review Schedule and submit it to the Academic Senate for approval.

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning or the Los Angeles Community College District databases will be used in all program reviews whenever possible. All approved course outlines and curriculum reviews will be on file in the Office of Instruction. All sources will be cited appropriately in order to verify data.

A Program Review Self-Study Committee will be composed to complete the program review. This committee will consist of:

- Division Chair or Manager
- Program Faculty
- Program Staff
- Administrator responsible for area
- Vice-President of Cluster
- One outside professional or alumni
- Two students currently enrolled in the program under review

Upon completion of all forms and collection of all pertinent information, the Division Chair or Manager will convene the committee. The committee will review and evaluate the documentation and develop a list of needs with a time line and an estimated budget. This written evaluation will be included in the program review.

The completed program review will be forwarded to the Division Council. The Division Council will review and discuss the evaluation and either return it to the self-study committee for further information or documentation or accept it. The Division Council will submit a written report with its evaluation of the program review.

All academic program evaluations will be sent to the Academic Senate for approval. If the Academic Senate does not concur with the Division Council's recommendations, it will remand them to the Program Review Committee. Written reports must accompany recommendations at every step.

If the Academic Senate concurs with the Division Council recommendations, it will forward them to the College President for concurrence. If the College President does not concur with the Senate's recommendation, collegial consultation will occur. If the College President agrees with the Senate's recommendation, the program review will be forwarded to the CPC for incorporation into the college educational master plan.
Los Angeles Harbor College
Discipline/Program Review Format

Academic Program Review
(Please submit one completed form for each program or certificate. Course outlines and sample syllabi may be submitted in digital format.)

Name of discipline: ______________________________________
Division chair: _____________________________ Phone number: _____________

Names and types of program:
Degree program ____________________________________________
Certificate program ___________________________________________
Skills certificate _____________________________________________

Attach discipline offerings from College publications

Attach current course outlines, accepted by the Curriculum Committee, for all approved classes offered in the program:

Current sample class syllabi for courses offered in the program are available for review in the Department/Division office.

Attach current Unit Plans

Please write a brief overview of the program. Align the program with the college goals and strategies. Include:

   Number of full-time faculty FTEF BY SEMESTER since last review or previous three years:

   Number of adjunct FTEF BY SEMESTER since last review or previous three years:

   Number of FTEF taught as overload by full-time faculty:

   Total FTEF BY SEMESTER since last review:

Document changes in support personnel, classifications, and budget since last review or the previous three years:
Number of sections offered including sections canceled, not listed in the class schedule, or combined:

GE credit courses:
Major required courses:
Elective courses:
Total sections:

Total WSCH:
GE courses:
Major required courses:
Elective courses:
Total WSCH:
Total WSCH to FTEF:

List WSCH to FTEF for the past three years BY SEMESTER:

List total numbers for past three years:
Degrees awarded:
Certificates awarded:
Skills certificates awarded:

Retention rate:
GE courses:
Major required courses:
Elective courses:
Overall retention rate:
Successful completion:

GE courses:

Major required courses:

Elective courses:

Overall successful completion rate:

What areas of the program need strengthening?

What are the strengths of the program?

Summarize program and unit plan modifications necessary for program improvement, including objectives, budgets, and timelines for implementation.

For programs requiring advisory committees, attach minutes from the last three meetings indicating that recommendations have been discussed.

Explain how course content is current and relevant to student needs.

What sources of data outside the college data set (if any) were taken into consideration in this part of the program review?

What trends are indicated by a review of the data?
Academic Support Program Review

DEFINITION OF AN ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROGRAM

An Academic Support program is any cost or revenue center that is not required to generate WSCH. Some programs must perform program review for state or agency mandated requirements. Those programs do not need to duplicate these efforts; however, they do need to update unit plans as necessary.

PROGRAM INITIATION

There are many ways in which a new program may become an active component of Los Angeles Harbor College. New programs may be initiated by any planning unit and must be approved as provided for in the Planning and Procedure manual.

These procedures apply to stand alone Academic Support programs as well as those incorporated in grants and specially funded programs.

Before becoming institutionalized, all Academic Support programs after consultation with the Senate where applicable must be approved by the College Planning Council (CPC) and the President of the college.

PROGRAM REVITALIZATION OR DISCONTINUANCE

The program review process may indicate that a program no longer successfully serves the purpose for which it was intended. In such cases, a program revitalization process will begin. This process is designed to modify, enhance, or modernize the program in order to allow it to continue.

A Program Revitalization Committee will be charged with the assignment of analyzing, evaluating, and recommending necessary changes to the program. The committee will be composed of all non-probationary personnel in the program, the administrator responsible for the program, a faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate, a representative from the appropriate bargaining unit, and a student representative.

This Committee is responsible for devising a plan to modify the program, including expenses so that it meets the college community needs and its budgetary constraints. After consultation with the Academic Senate where appropriate, a new unit plan will be submitted to the CPC and the College President for approval.

Program review and revitalization may determine that a program no longer fulfills the college mission and goals or is prohibitively expensive to revitalize. In such a case, the Review Committee may recommend to the CPC that the program be discontinued.

The CPC may develop an appeals process.
Academic Support Program Review Process

The program review process will be under the direct supervision of the Manager responsible for the program. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning or the Los Angeles Community College District databases will be used in all program reviews whenever possible. All sources will be cited appropriately in order to verify data.

A Program Review Self-Study Committee will be composed to complete the program review. This committee will consist of:

Manager
Program Staff
Administrator responsible for the area
Vice-President of Cluster
One outside professional or alumni
Two currently enrolled students
Two faculty, one appointed by the Academic Senate and one by the AFT

The manager will convene the committee, assign duties, and accumulate pertinent information. Upon completion of all forms and accumulation of all support documentation, the committee will review the document, assess the successes of the program, and develop a list of needs with a timeline and an estimated budget. This written evaluation will be included in the program review.

The completed program review will be forwarded to the College Planning Council (CPC) cluster committee responsible for the program. The cluster committee will review the program review documents and either return it to the self-study committee for further information or documentation, or accept it. Either way the cluster committee will issue a written report to accompany the document.

All final Academic Support Program Reviews will be sent to the CPC for review, acceptance, and incorporation into the College Master Plan.
Academic Support Program Review
(Please submit one completed form for each program.)

Name of department or unit:

Supervisor or manager:  Phone Number:

Name and type of program:

Please write a brief overview of the program. Align the program with the college goals and strategies.

Number of full-time personnel BY SEMESTER since last review:

Number of part-time personnel BY SEMESTER since last review:

Total FTEP BY SEMESTER since last review:

Number of support personnel and classifications with history since last review:

Students served by semester for the past three years:

Quantitative data to support program efficiency and value added:

Qualitative data to support program efficiency and value added:

What areas of the program need strengthening?

What are the strengths of this program?

Summarize program and unit plan modifications necessary for program improvement.

Attach current Unit Plans.
Support Documentation

The following template is to be used as appropriate to the individual program being reviewed. Additional appropriate documentation can be used as required.

Program:

Division:

Beginning date of self-study  Completion date of self-study

Self-study committee members:

Division chair:

Program faculty:

Program staff:

Program administrator:

Vice-president of cluster:

Professional or alumni:

Students:

State mission, goals, and objectives of program:

State how the program mission, goals, and objectives match those of the College:

State purpose of program:

History of program:

Describe any unique institutional goal the program satisfies:

For each degree and certificate offered by the program, complete the following:

Degree

Program requirements for degree:

Certificate

Program requirements for certificate:
Number of major students:

Numbers of sections, by year over five years:

Number of students, by year over five years:

Number of full-time faculty: (immediate past year)

Number of adjunct faculty: (immediate past year)

Total full-time equivalent faculty: (immediate past year)

Ratio of students to FTEF: (immediate past year)

Full-time equivalent students (FTES):

Number of permanent staff: (immediate past year)

Number of full-time equivalent staff: (immediate past year)

Number of full-time equivalent personnel: (immediate past year)

Gender breakdown of students: (immediate past year)

Ethnic breakdown of students: (immediate past year)

___ African-American ___ Native Americans
___ Asian ___ Pacific Islander
___ Filipino ___ White
___ Latino ___ Other/Declined to State

Age breakdown of students: (immediate past year)

___ 19 and under ___ 35-39
___ 20-24 ___ 40-44
___ 25-29 ___ 45-54
___ 30-34 ___ 55 and over

Number of special students served: (immediate past year)

Describe any special funds awarded to program:
Within the first half of the semester, the Student Survey should be administered to students in the program or discipline involved in the program review self-study. Beyond that time, input from students who have dropped is lost, and information from these students may be some of the most valuable for the program. A copy of a generic survey appears on the following pages. The survey does not need to collect data such as ethnicity, age, gender, or GPA, which are available from other sources and may be matched-by student identification number.

You may wish to add questions to the generic survey that deal specifically with the own program. It is an excellent opportunity to gather valuable information with little additional effort. The research office will tabulate results and a copy of the survey with results will automatically be added to the data book. You are able to use this information in analyzing the current program as well as in future planning. You will also wish to develop surveys to poll groups other than students, such as faculty, staff, and/or community members. The research office may assist with this process.

1. Review the generic survey and determine which additional questions would be valuable to the program. Non-instructional programs and services may need to modify some of the generic questions. Contact the research office if this is the case.

2. Write additional multiple choice questions following the format of the generic survey. There should be no more than 50 questions. Remember that the questions must be multiple-choice, and only one answer per question can be selected. If open-ended questions are desired, you may add them, but you will have to evaluate those answers.

3. Submit supplemental questions to the research office by mid-September in order to have final surveys available for the classrooms early in the fall semester. The office staff will read them over for clarity and format and return them to you so that you can finalize the survey and have it duplicated. Directions for administering the surveys will be provided.

4. The surveys should be administered within a one- to two-week period. When you have finished, return the surveys to the research office. The results will be tabulated and returned to you with the data book so that you can incorporate the information into the self-study document.

5. If you have a large number of students (over four or five hundred), you may wish to administer the survey to selected classes only. Contact the research office to help you determine a representative sampling.

6. If you would like a breakdown by groups of the information obtained from the student surveys, contact the research analyst prior to finalizing the questions. Staff will help you determine whether it is possible to do and if so, the most useful categories for the program (e.g., day vs. night students or new vs. continuing).
SAMPLE

Program Review Student Survey

In order to continuously improve instruction, course offerings, student services, and Los Angeles Harbor College's educational environment, we need the input. Please answer the following-questions to the best of your ability, using the Scantron sheet provided.

IF YOU HAVE FILLED OUT THIS SURVEY IN ANOTHER CLASS THIS SEMESTER, PLEASE ENTER THE NAME AND SECTION OF THE CLASS HERE

Use-a soft pencil on the Scantron answer sheet. Please select only ONE answer to each question.

If you wish to change the response, erase the first mark completely.

Enter your Social Security number in the space provided on the answer sheet.

Please fill in the SSN on the Scantron Sheet in the spaces provided. This information is used only to compare groups of students and prevent multiple surveys from individuals within the same program. The Social Security number and the identity will remain confidential and are used only by the Office of Institutional Research to assist in program review.

1. The number of hours per week that I usually work are:
   a. I do not work at all
   b. Less than 10 hours
   c. 10 - 20 hours
   d. 21 - 30 hours
   e. 31 - 40 hours
   f. 40+ hours

2. In addition to Los Angeles Harbor College, I also am attending classes at:
   a. El Camino College
   b. Another Los Angeles Community College
   c. High School
   d. Other School
   e. No other school

3. I am attending other colleges because: (Answer only if attending another campus)
   a. Required course(s) not available at Harbor College
   b. Course(s) is offered by not at a convenient time
   c. Classes at Harbor College were filled
   d. Reputation of the other college

4. I would like to see more class sections at the following time:
   a. Saturday classes
   b. Evening classes (after 4 p.m.)
   c. Afternoon classes (noon to 5 p.m.)
   d. Morning classes (8 a.m. to noon)
   e. Early morning classes (before 8 a.m.)
   f. Internet classes
   g. ITV classes

5. Mark all that apply:
   Most of my courses take place:
   a. Day courses (before 4:30 p.m.)
   b. Evening courses (after 4:30 p.m.)
   c. Both during the day and the evening
   d. Weekends only
   e. Day, evening, and weekends
   f. On-line courses only
   g. ITV classes
6. The main reason I chose Los Angeles Harbor College was
   a. Convenience to home or work
   b. Affordability
   c. Availability of courses not offered elsewhere.
   d. Recommendation by a friend or relative
   e. Recommendation by a high school counselor or teacher
   f. College reputation
   g. Other

7. My access to computers and the Internet can be described as (check the one that best applies to you):
   a. I own my own computer, and I am connected to the Internet.
   b. I own my own computer, but I am not connected to the Internet.
   c. I have an e-mail account.
   d. I do not own a computer, but I have access to one at school, work, etc.

8. My computer skills can best be described as (select one):
   a. Able to trouble shoot operating system problems with my computer
   b. Regularly use the internet, other applications, and can download information
   c. Regularly use the Internet and some other applications, Word, Excel, etc.
   d. Only use the internet; often need help from others
   e. Non-existent; I don't have any computer skills
Program Review Policy and Procedures Manual

This document is signed with the understanding that the program review student survey is a sample and that the Academic Support Program Review Process is in draft form.

Approved by the Academic Senate of Los Angeles Harbor College

Susan McMurtry

Date: 21 Nov. 2003

Approved by the College President

Date: 22 Jan 03

Prepared: 11/21/03 swm
APPENDIX

Program Review Report Feedback: Academic Senate Program Review Committee
Program Review Report Feedback
Program: Science and F&CS Date of Report: 2005

III. Target Areas of Concern or Interest
A. Determine whether additional dialog/group (such as advisory committees or focus groups) are needed. Record justification if they are not needed. Include minutes of meetings.
B. Determine specific courses or concerns for questions to faculty, staff, and students in surveys or focus group discussions. Include justification of choices.

Rating: 3

Evaluation Comments: No reference to student surveys or community/focus groups were made.
Each discipline evaluated their needs and made recommendations which appear in the discipline unit plans.
Some new areas of interest were added to this report as an addendum, but they have not been incorporated into the planning process nor do they have references and data to justify their need. The next step would be to develop plans for all "target areas of interest".

IV. Propose Recommendations and Implementation
A. Create a new unit plan to address community, faculty, and student concerns and needs.
B. Ensure all revised course outlines or other documents are filed with appropriate bodies.
   (Course outlines provided to Curriculum Committee and new course descriptions to Academic Affairs, for example.)

Rating: 2

Evaluation Comments: The unit plan is well written. Some objectives need verbs that focus on student learning. A major concern is that it is not a Division plan, rather a division and 4 separate department plans. The next step for planning purposes is to prioritize all objectives into a Division Plan. There is no evidence of item B.

V. Create Report
A. Create files of documentation for the Program Review process and report. Include:
   1. the minutes from meetings and notes from focus group discussions
   2. samples of outlines and syllabi with stated student learning outcomes (excellent job)
   3. narrative summary for incorporation into future unit plans

Evaluation Comments: All four Departments wrote excellent summaries that are incorporated into their unit plans. In some cases, the review and analysis of program data need more work.
Rating: Item 1 is missing (3 rating), Item 2 is excellent (1 rating), and Item 3 (2)

An overview of the program review report.
Most of the essential components for program review have been addressed. The next step is for the Division to compile this information into a Division Report. The prioritization of the Division Unit plan is needed.

Reviewing members of ASPR:

Date of Review: July 17, 2006

May 2006 – Academic Senate Program Review Committee
APPENDIX

Academic Senate Program Review
Committee Reports to the Academic Senate
The ASPRn committee has evaluated each of the academic program review documents on the website. The evaluations are being presented to division chairs for further action. During the months of April and May, ASPRN met at the request of the Senate to combine the two program review manuals previously approved by CPC and the President and to update the language of the documents to match more closely accreditation standards.

As a result of these reviews, the committee pinpointed some common areas that need improvement across disciplines and divisions. A plan has been presented to Academic Affairs to address some of these areas through Opening Day activities as well as continued assistance to division chairs.

The committee wishes to acknowledge the evident hard work on the part of faculty who worked diligently this past year and more to assure accurate and up-to-date course outlines and syllabi. Incorporating the new requirements of student learning outcomes is the strong base that allows effective program review.

Remaining areas of general weakness in the program review process are identified as:

1. Furthering a team approach to program review that includes multiple faculty, students, and additional input from the community or other sources.
2. Using data analysis to support discussions of program strengths and weaknesses. (This data may be both quantitative fact book based and qualitative surveys or focus groups and meetings.)
3. There is insufficient connection between data and student needs with program plans.

Proposed Opening Day activities will include: accolades for the hard work of much of the faculty on various parts of program review, a brief overview of how and why to analyze data, help with connecting course outline objectives/SLOs with syllabi and the assessment of those SLOs at the class and course level. Division meetings will be encouraged to review the PR evaluations and especially to discuss how discipline level SLOs might be assessed.

These recommendations are designed to continue to improve our program review process and especially to address concerns of the accreditation team.

Respectfully submitted by

Joan Thomas-Spiegel, Jim Stanbery, Sally Fasteau, and Mark Wood.
APPENDIX

Recently Adopted Unit Planning Templates
Unit Planning
LA Harbor College

**Fundamental Assumption:** the defining mission for the whole college is student success in learning. Multiple measures drive resource allocation, but the essential criterion is the assessment of student learning outcomes.

**Fundamental Assumption:** planning should drive budgeting, even in hard financial times. It is essential that the college follow a well-defined planning cycle each year. Planning should flow upward from the individual units through the cluster operational plan to the college strategic plan itself (see flow chart appended below).

**Fundamental Assumption:** the purpose of unit planning is to bring forward and update objectives from the program review and to identify on a yearly basis specific activities to achieve those departmental objectives. Unit plans are to be completed each September as prescribed by the Planning Policy and Procedure Manual (see timeline appended below).

**Fundamental Assumption:** Class scheduling is a semester-by-semester function of the division chair and the dean.

For academic units, planning begins with program review. Program review is a comprehensive evaluation of each program, evaluating its current level of effectiveness in achieving student learning and projecting out for the next five years until the next program review (one year in the case of occupational programs). Based on the best information available at the time, the division should identify objectives to be accomplished in each of the intervening years.

The unit plan is a yearly evaluation of the unit's direction and suggested activities. The objectives for that year derive from the program review in light of current year data. The unit plan should include an executive summary of the plan, stating the division objectives and the activities to accomplish them. The plan should also include a priority ranking of those activities, a statement of how the activities support the mission and strategies of the college, a list of resources needed or available (including staffing and technology implications), and an estimated cost. Supporting data may include but should not be limited to the following:

- Assessment results at the course, program, or ILO levels
- Environmental scan data, including employment data
- Retention/persistent rates
- Inequities in gender or race balance if appropriate
- Changes in Ed Code, Title 5, or accrediting agency requirements
- FTES or FTES/FTEF
- Transfer rates
- Job placement rates
Executive Summary

Activities Description Narrative: please describe suggested activities, including grant proposals to be written, new course or program initiatives, or program viability studies in priority order.

SLO Assessment Results Narrative: please describe assessment activities that support proposed unit initiatives.

Staffing Implications: if any request will require additional classified support or training, please describe its extent.

Technology Implications: if any request involves technology, please describe its impact on the network, licensing, repair, training and support.
B. PLANNING FLOW CHART

Initiator/s of a proposal submit activity to units which are to implement the proposal.

Unit chair forwards copies of the activity form to Academic Senate or technical committees for any CLEARANCES the form specifies

"CLEARANCE" committees include: e.g., Curriculum, APPC, PFE, Voc. Ed. (Academic Senate); e.g., ITAC, Facilities/Work Env., (specialized)

UNIT PRIORITIZES ACTIVITIES all incorporated into UNIT PLAN

CLUSTER PLANNING COMMITTEE integrates unit priorities as CLUSTER PLAN

The cluster planning committees are:
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE subcommittees:
e.g., Staff Development
STUDENT SERVICES COMMITTEE subcommittees:
e.g., Matriculation, Enrollment Management
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE subcommittees:
e.g., Facilities, Parking
PRESIDENT'S subcommittees:
e.g., ITAC

PAC integrates cluster priorities as COLLEGE

FHPC prioritizes faculty position requests according to college plan (responsible to Academic Senate)

Implementation of authorized plan changes tracked and assessed.

College President

Budgets activities from cleared sources in priority order.
### C. PLANNING TIMELINE

#### College Annual Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FORUMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLANNING OFFICE

- Gather input from campus units and clusters via surveys or forums; Update external scans
- Vocabulary of goals, needs, outcome assessment, etc.
- Update KPI progress reports (Synthesize Internal/External scans; Program review reports as appropriate; Evaluation/Review of Unit Plans; Survey results as appropriate)
- ONGOING: Communicate College Strategic Plans to the community and LACCD

#### CLUSTERS

- Integrate unit priorities as cluster plan
- Cluster plans forwarded to PAC
- Plans subject to continuous updates
- Conduct annual evaluation/revision of cluster/unit plan; forward report to Planning Office and campus forum
- Plans subject to continuous updates

#### UNITS

- Unit plans forwarded to cluster
- Plans subject to continuous updates
- Establish annual unit priorities and budget requests (unit plan form)
- Conduct annual review of unit plans
- Plans subject to continuous updates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Sec #</th>
<th>Lec</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Lec-Lab</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Hrly</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Complet'n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>yyyy</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 3</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>yyyy</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 3 Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 5</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 hr</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>yyyy</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 5 Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>4990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>yyyy</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4921 Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>yyyy</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 33 Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 101*</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>7 hr</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>yyyy</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 102</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>7 hr</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>yyyy</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Program Served</td>
<td>Sec #</td>
<td>Lec</td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>Lec-Lab</td>
<td>Reg</td>
<td>Hrly</td>
<td>Course Hours-Listed As:</td>
<td>FTEF Budget</td>
<td>Course Enrollment Summaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>FTES FTEF Complet'n Complet'n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio5 PACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physio 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>671</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

- Biol 103: Major
- Micro 20
- Physio 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Lec Hrs</th>
<th>Lab Hrs</th>
<th>Lc-Lb hrs</th>
<th>FTEF-R</th>
<th>FTEF-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Sections Offered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro 40 Totals</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physio 1 Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(less relevant for Bio Dept)
Executive Summary

This year our department has made excellent strides in meeting our six-year program review targets, adding one new faculty member and upgrading the required software in our computer lab. Our final plan of action from the program review specifies that this year we must replace at least a third of the computers in the lab with increased speed and memory. Our assessment of student learning outcomes shows that the majority of our students are learning what we have expected of them at the program level, but there are several curricular changes that we need to do in two courses. We will also be proposing a new program in Surgical Technology in response to an overture from a community college in Nebraska to offer the program online. We also plan to explore development of a degree and certificate in mechatronics, as suggested by the health care focus group that met at Harbor in December.

Activities Description Narrative: please describe suggested activities, including grant proposals to be written, new course or program initiatives, or program viability studies in priority order.

1. Purchase 12 Dell Inspiron dual-core computers to enable us to use the new software for advanced rendering that has become standard in the industry. Included in the purchase price should be an on-site service agreement covering a three-year period. See attached evaluation of current computers.

2. Revise course outlines for Nursing 12 and Nursing 34. Results from the NCLEX and course level assessments indicate that our nursing students have not achieved the required level of proficiency in phlebotomy and in writing patient care summaries. One faculty member will receive a stipend to identify the appropriate remedy and rewrite course outline. See attached assessment report forms.

3. Develop a new program offering in Surgical Technology in conjunction with Southwest Community College in Lincoln, Nebraska. Southwest Community College has approached LA Harbor to create a memorandum of understanding to offer our students a degree in Surgical Technology by distance learning. The program at Southwest is fully accredited. Students would take all of the prerequisites at LA Harbor and then receive their Surgical Tech classes in the clinical setting in a local hospital. We expect an additional 10 to 12 FTES per year at the outset, increasing to 20 to 25 in two years. See attached memorandum of understanding, EMI data, and accreditation data for Southwest Community College.

4. Research and develop, if appropriate, both a certificate and a degree in mechatronics. We will conduct additional focus groups, explore curriculum at
other colleges and universities, perform an environmental scan and analysis of EMI data. We will also analyze the existing curriculum at LA Harbor to determine which courses would be applicable to the program. This analysis will also include recommendations for technology and infrastructure changes that would be required. Based on these findings we expect to develop any missing curriculum for both certificate and degree programs at LA Harbor. See the attached minutes of the health care focus group in December 2007.

SLO Assessment Results Narrative: please describe assessment activities that support proposed unit initiatives.

1. Students at LA Harbor had a pass rate of 95% on the NCLEX, the nationally administered nursing certification exam under the auspices of the NCSBN. Item analysis of the individual topics indicates that Harbor students were trained better than other students in the areas of pharmacy (97%) and pediatric care (98%). We will continue to focus our training on these areas. However, Harbor students had more difficulty with drawing blood (89%) and writing patient care summaries (91%). The nursing faculty agree that increasing time spent on these two areas by three hours and adding an additional exercise within the clinical environment will remedy this issue.

2. On the final exam for Nursing 12, three common questions were embedded in each section and the aggregated results showed that the students did not fully understand the three requirements for patient care summary writing, scoring 67% correct which is 13 points below the expected standard of 80%.

Staffing Implications: if any request will require additional classified support or training, please describe its extent.

1. Implementation of new rendering software will require additional training for four faculty members prior to opening of classes in August. Training can be done online through the vendor’s web site; however, a stipend of $300 per faculty member will be required to compensate for the training time.

2. The addition of the surgical technology program will require additional time on the part of the Director of Nursing to arrange clinical sites at the local hospitals. The Director of Nursing has estimated that this activity will require four hours of work per week to be paid as a stipend of $4,000 per semester. This program, however, should be cost neutral to LA Harbor because by virtue of the memorandum of understanding Southwest Community College will pay for all administrative costs of the program.
Technology Implications: if any request involves technology, please describe its impact on the network, licensing, repair, training and support.

1. Addition of 12 new computers will require set up and installation over spring break. Purchase price includes three-year on-site maintenance agreement, so there should be no impact on ITS.

2. Installation of new software on 36 machines in the computer lab will be done by ITS staff. The Director of IT has estimated that this will require approximately 15 hours and can be done within the regular workweek of ITS staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline ID</th>
<th>Department Priority (1 to 99)</th>
<th>College Strategy Supported (separate columns if two)</th>
<th>Student Success Initiative</th>
<th>Technology Access</th>
<th>Department Objective (link to Program Review)</th>
<th>Proposed Activity</th>
<th>Brief Summary of SLO Assessment Results (See attached forms)</th>
<th>List Other Supporting Documents/Links Attached (E.G., WSCH, Wait Lists, Retention, Environmental Scans)</th>
<th>Resources Required (list faculty, equipment, etc.)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost and Source (E.G., Program 100, VTEA, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal 1: 1.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3 goal of 6-year action plan</td>
<td>Purchase 12 Inspiron dual-core computers to facilitate student use of advanced rendering software</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ITS assessment of remaining life of current machines</td>
<td>12 computers monitors</td>
<td>$13,000 Prog 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goal 1: 1.2, Goal 1: 1.2</td>
<td>Emerging need from assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise course outlines for Nursing 12 and Nursing 34</td>
<td>NCLEX and embedded assessments—see attachment</td>
<td>研制新课程大纲，涵盖护理学12和护理学34门课程的必要内容</td>
<td>Stipend for one faculty member</td>
<td>$1,000 VTEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal 1: 1.4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New, emerging need</td>
<td>Add 4 new sections (2 each English 28 and English 31)</td>
<td>See attached analysis of student portfolios</td>
<td>研制新课程大纲，涵盖英语28和英语31课程的必要内容</td>
<td>See attached Course Offering Data Template</td>
<td>Hourly Faculty</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Goal 1: 1.4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Year 3 goal of 6-year action plan</td>
<td>Software training for faculty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Year 3目标的6年行动计划的实施，包括软件培训和教师发展计划</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300 stipend for four faculty</td>
<td>$1,200 Prog 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal 1: 1.4</td>
<td>New, emerging need</td>
<td>Exploration of certificate/degree program in mechatronics</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EMI data attached</td>
<td>探索在机械电子学领域证书/学位课程的实施，包括数据整理和分析</td>
<td>Reassigned time for faculty member</td>
<td>$2,000 Prog 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost for 3 additional focus groups and DACUM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3个额外的重点小组和DACUM的实施成本</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800 Prog 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

Strategic Plan
Los Angeles Harbor College

Vision

*The College vision is to create an a personalized, student-centered learning environment dedicated to preparing our community for life’s challenges and opportunities.*

Mission Statement

The mission of Los Angeles Harbor College is to offer an environment that fosters learning by providing comprehensive programs that meet the educational needs of students and are appropriate and useful to the community we serve, including:

- Degree and Transfer programs
- Vocational and workforce preparation
- Basic skills instruction
- English as a second language
- Credit and noncredit courses for life-long learning
- Contract education including customized corporate training
- Community services
- Support services
- Information literacy

An essential aspect of the mission for the community we serve is to advance economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous workforce improvement and civic responsibility.

We are committed to student learning in a supportive educational environment that recognizes the uniqueness of individuals, provides a center for the cultural enrichment of the community, and seeks dynamic dialog and reflective evaluation and improvement of the institution through ongoing assessment and evaluation of measurable student learning outcomes.
Values

♦ Student Success
♦ Excellence
♦ Integrity
♦ A Supportive Environment
♦ Personal and Institutional Accountability
♦ Civic Responsibility

Our Goals to Achieve Student Success

LEARNING & INSTRUCTION
To offer innovative, state-of-the-art, learner centered instruction in all Harbor College programs to promote effective learning.

STUDENT SUPPORT & SERVICES
To provide a positive and respectful environment that fosters educational and personal achievement.

PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE
To maintain an environment where students and all college personnel have a voice and an opportunity to participate effectively in governance.

ECONOMIC RESOURCES
To optimize and be accountable for the responsible use of all financial resources.

PARTNERSHIPS
To collaborate with local and global communities and organizations to enhance opportunities that are beneficial to our students, the college, and its mission.

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT & PHYSICAL RESOURCES
To provide and ensure an aesthetically pleasing, safe and healthful environment conducive to learning.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT
To ensure a campus community that values diversity and promotes and encourages a climate of mutual respect, personal and professional growth, effective communication and teamwork.
Our Student Learning Outcomes

From our signs:
A student who successfully completes a learning experience at Harbor College will be able to demonstrate:
   I. Effective communication skills
   II. Critical thinking and problem solving skills
   III. Appreciation of cultural diversity, global awareness and aesthetics
   IV. Personal, professional and civic responsibility
   V. Information management and technological competence

Courtesy of Mark Wood
This is the version passed by the senate 10/6/05

A student who successfully completes a Learning Experience, from enrichment to Transfer AA, at Los Angeles Harbor College can:
1. Assume personal responsibility for her or his actions, and work effectively as an individual and as a member of a group.
2. Express ideas with clarity, logic, and originality in both spoken and written English.
3. Apply mathematical principles to address and solve problems.
4. Gather and interpret data, using a variety of scientific methods, to address and solve both practical and theoretical problems.
5. Analyze, understand, and evaluate diverse ideas, beliefs, and behaviors.
6. Access, interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information using multiple resources, including current information technology.
7. Enhance physical and psychological well-being by examining and applying health and wellness concepts.
8. Explore and express personal creativity throughout her or his life.
9. Understand herself or himself and others as members of our diverse global community.
10. Understand and evaluate issues concerning use of the world’s natural resources.
Goals & Strategies to Achieve Student Success with Accountability Measures

GOAL 1

Learning & Instruction
Luis Rosas, Vice President of Academic Affairs

To offer innovative, state-of-the-art, learner centered instruction in all Harbor College programs to promote effective learning.

Strategies:

1.1 Develop an Educational Master Plan that addresses emerging and ongoing instructional priorities.
1.2 Use program review as a means to evaluate the relevance, content, and methodology of instructional programs and adjust, revise and develop accordingly to improve student learning.
1.3 Ensure a technological infrastructure that supports academic and administrative needs and functions.
1.4 Promote teaching excellence and innovation that results in an effective teaching/learning environment.
1.5 Provide sufficient staff, supplies, space, and equipment for an optimal teaching/learning environment.

Accountability Measures

Curriculum Quality
How does the College determine curriculum quality?

Measures:

a. Program review up-to-date:
   1. Course outlines current with measurable student learning outcomes (SLO), and entry/exit competencies
   2. Clear and specific course syllabi
   3. Consistency of materials
   4. Industry and enrollment trends considered
b. Appropriateness of learning experience measured against needs to perform in that domain (e.g. Nursing Board pass rates)
c. External standards met (Health and Safety, student assessment validation, prerequisite validation including accreditation and certification)
d. Articulation of courses and programs
e. Qualitative and/or quantitative measures to assure technological support is current and relevant for instruction.
Educational Innovation
Does the College have evidence of seeking, developing and applying innovative methodologies?

Measures:
- a. Participation of on-going learning by faculty and staff and integration into learning.
- b. Recognition and awards given by external bodies.
- c. Documentation of innovation activities in the classroom.
- d. Documentation of best practices.
- e. Program Review.

Educational Goal Achievement
How do we know when goals are achieved?

Measures:
- a. Student Learning Outcomes
- b. Course completion
- c. Program completion
- d. Transfers
- e. Transfer readiness
- f. Vocational preparation
GOAL 2

Student Support and Services
Abbie Patterson, Vice

Student Services
To provide a positive and respectful environment that fosters educational and personal achievement.

Strategies:

2.1 Promote awareness of and response to students' needs.
2.2 Provide students with opportunities to develop informed decisions toward the achievement of their goals.
2.3 Develop and support teaching/learning strategies and student services that promote student success.

Accountability Measures

Enrollment Development
*Are we enrolling students who apply to the College so that they achieve their educational and personal goals?*

Measures:
  a. Matriculation tracking
  b. Completion and Retention tracking

Student Services Program Quality & Utilization of Services
*Is the College providing efficient and needed services to assist student achievement?*

Measures:
  a. Point of Service student surveys
  b. Student services program review

Educational Goal Achievement
*Are students able to successfully reach their goals?*

Measures:
  a. Course completion
  b. Degree and Certificate completion
  c. Transfers
  d. Transfer readiness
GOAL 3

Participatory Governance
Dr. Linda Spink, President

To maintain an environment where students and all college personnel have a voice and an opportunity to participate effectively in governance.

Strategies:

3.1 Involve all governance bodies in the development and implementation of the strategic plan.
3.2 Establish an open system of communication that supports timely decision-making.
3.3 Ensure accountability in decision-making processes and implementation.
3.4 Ensure compliance with required rules, regulations and policies.
3.5 Offer meaningful opportunities for students to participate in the governance process.

Accountability Measures

Institutional Efficiency

Do we have a functioning Participatory Governance process?

Measures:

a. Annual determination of goals achieved for strategic and operational plans
b. Active participation of all college constituencies in governance process. Given opportunity for participation, identify a participation target for each constituency.

c. Active participation of all college constituencies in accreditation process.
d. On-going review and implementation of operational plan.
To optimize and be accountable for the responsible use of all financial resources.

**Strategies:**

4.1 Align budgeting and planning so that all expenditures are connected to the master plan.
4.2 Develop and maintain a budgeting process that is understandable, accessible, and accountable to all members of the college community.
4.3 Develop alternative strategies to increase revenue streams.
4.4 Conduct an ongoing review of the budget to respond to the dynamic fiscal and political environment.

**Accountability Measures**

**Institutional Efficiency**

*How does the College allocate resources and align college resources with expenditures?*

Measures:

- a. Cost/FTES (students)
- b. WSCH/FTEF (faculty)
- c. Percent of budget linked with plans
- d. Classroom utilization
- e. Identify sources of revenue and amount available related to need:
  - Enrollment
  - Non-enrollment
  - Categorical
  - Grants and Specially Funded Programs
  - District Allocation formula
- f. Fiscal effectiveness of expenditures
  - Determine target dollars needed
  - Assess appropriateness of allocation of revenues
  - Determine fiscal effectiveness of revenues to expenditures
  - Minimize liability

**Enrollment Development**

*How does the College optimize our economic resources to enhance enrollment?*

Measures:

- a. WSCH (Weekly Student Contact Hours)
- b. FTES (Full-time Equivalent Students)
- c. Retention
Partnerships

Acting Vice President, Workforce

Development

To collaborate with local and global communities and organizations to enhance opportunities that are beneficial to our students, the college, and its mission.

Strategies:

5.1 Identify and implement partnerships that support college and community educational needs.
5.2 Communicate and coordinate college resources for initiating effective partnerships.

Accountability Measures

Community Relations

Are the partnerships consistent with the Mission of the College?

Measures:

a. Coordinate tracking of informal and formal partnerships with:
   - Job placement tracking
   - Employer surveys (pay and not-for-pay)
   - Advisory committee participation
   - Community surveys and feedback
b. Maintain an inventory of community and industry partnerships documenting the qualitative and quantitative value of each.
c. Document frequency and effectiveness of community outreach by College administration, staff and students.
d. Monitor contributions and support from the community:
   - Foundation campaign successes
   - Scholarship donations
   - Student activity accounts
e. Document public relations articles

Program Innovation and Instructional Partnerships

Are we responding to our community’s instructional needs?

Measures:

a. Number of programs developed in response to community needs and demands.
b. Number of community outreach programs.
c. Surveys and tracking of program participants.

Educational Goal Achievement

How can we document goal achievement?

a. Occupational Career Certificates, Skills Certificates, and Degrees
To provide and ensure an aesthetically pleasing, safe and healthful environment conducive to learning.

Strategies:

6.1 Identify the college facilities and equipment needs and develop a plan to address these needs.
6.2 Update facilities and equipment to support current and future college functions.
6.3 Create a college-wide commitment to the care and safety of the campus.
6.4 Maintain evacuation and disaster plans.

Accountability Measures

Satisfaction Surveys
How safe, healthy and pleasing is our environment?

Measures:
  a. Internal surveys
  b. External surveys

College and Community Relations
How does the community perceive the College environment?

Measures:
  a. Community surveys and feedback
  b. Contributions and support from community

Institutional Efficiency
Does the College make a deliberate effort to maintain a safe and efficient environment?

Measures:
  a. Student-Right-To-Know (SRTK)
  b. Workmen’s Compensation data
  c. Compliance issues

Progress on Campus Construction and Development
Has the College developed and initiated a construction plan that will result in a facility that will serve our community and will be completed in a timely manner?

Measures:
  a. Development of campus plan
  b. Adhere to timelines in the 5-year Facilities Master Plan
  c. Achievement of 5-year Capital Construction Plan
  d. Internal and community Climate surveys
GOAL 7

President

To ensure a campus community that values diversity and promotes and encourages a climate of mutual respect, personal and professional growth, effective communication, and teamwork.

Strategies:

7.1 Establish an effective college communication system.
7.2 Support and implement a staff development plan that maximizes human resources.
7.3 Value and recognize contributions that benefit the college community.
7.4 Provide sufficient staff for efficient operation of a comprehensive college.
7.5 Support of policies that maximize diversity and quality in hiring and performance.

Accountability Measures

Satisfaction Surveys
Is Human Resource and Development responsive to College needs?

Measures:
  a. Internal surveys
  b. Staff development reports
  c. Documentation of College diversity
  d. Employee evaluation

Personnel Goal Achievement
Are the College personnel enabled to learn, grow and achieve?

Measures:
  a. Staff development reports
  b. Tuition reimbursement
  c. Conference attendance

Knowledgeable and Effective Selection and Retention of Personnel
Is the College being staffed appropriately, competently, and as needed to serve our students?

Measures:
  a. Ability to fill positions in scheduled time frames
  b. Retention and attrition of staff
  c. Documentation of College diversity
  d. Complete personnel evaluations as specified in contracts and policies
PLANNING LEXICON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Strategic Plan</th>
<th>A concise statement of the enduring College wide vision, values, mission, goals, strategies, and accountability measures that inspire the operational plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>An ideal state of where the College sees itself in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Agreed upon principles that guide the college and the population to be served as defined in state law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>States the purpose of the College and the population to be served as defined in state law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Long-term outcomes identified to achieve the vision and mission of the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>A plan, method, or sequence of activities for accomplishing a specific college goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Measures</td>
<td>Objective, measurable and observable benchmarks specifically designed to assess progress towards College goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Plans</td>
<td>Cluster, unit or single focus plans that include specific measurable/observable objectives and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable/Observable Objectives</td>
<td>Statement of what will be achieved and how it will be measured with a timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>A specific action or actions that will be carried out to achieve the objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Review/Evaluation</th>
<th>The systematic review of the degree to which objectives of a program or unit have been achieved and upon which an operational plan is revised.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Scan</td>
<td>An assessment of external factors influencing the performance and responsiveness of the College to the needs of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Scan</td>
<td>An assessment of internal factors influencing the performance and responsiveness of the College towards the fulfillment of its mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Focus Plan</td>
<td>Covers a unified subject matter or issue which may emanate from that single aspect of all unit plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>All the units reporting to a single senior staff member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>The smallest organizational sub-division headed by a manager or supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>