

**Pierce COLLEGE**

**LOS ANGELES PIERCE COLLEGE  
ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT**

**March 15, 2008**

## Table of Contents

Statement on Report Preparation	p. 3
Recommendation 5 The District should provide leadership in supporting the progress toward incorporating and achieving stated SLOs as a component of faculty evaluation. (Standard III.A.1.c.)	p. 4
Recommendation 6: The College, in concert with the District, should develop a comprehensive long-term plan for addressing the backlog of deferred maintenance projects which, if left unattended, may compromise the quality of the student learning environment. (Standard III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b)	p. 9
Recommendation 9: The Board of Trustees should complete the self-evaluation process by discussing and developing a set of Board goals to respond to any issues identified in its self-evaluation. The Board should institutionalize the goal-setting and measuring of accomplishments as part of the self-evaluation process. (Standard IV.B.1.g)	p. 14
Recommendation 10: Although in practice the evaluation of the college presidents and district chancellor occurs on a regular basis and is an inclusive process, the team recommends that the District develop a written policy that clearly defines the evaluation process. (Standard IV.B.1.j)	p. 16
Commission Concern 2: The College will need to undergo a site visit of its recently approved Program for Accelerated College Education (PACE) at two off-campus sites: Beaudry-Shatto and Kennedy High School as mandated by federal guidelines which require such a visit within six months after program implementation. This visit will be scheduled for September, 2007.	p. 18
Review and Approval by the Board of Trustees	p. 19

## Statement on Report Preparation

The progress report responses were developed collaboratively between Pierce College and the Los Angeles Community College District Office.

The district chancellor's office established a Faculty Evaluation Taskforce to interpret the use of student learning outcomes in faculty evaluations under the current contract and the college took a number of steps to ensure that student learning outcomes were included in the evaluations of probationary and tenured faculty starting in the 2007-08 academic year. At the college the president, vice president of academic affairs, the local faculty union leadership, the department chairs, the academic senate, the dean of research and planning, and the student learning outcomes coordinator have all been active participants in responding to Recommendation 5. Information about these activities was provided by the involved parties from the college and the district to be included in the progress report.

The response to Recommendation 6 was developed by the director of plant facilities at Pierce College in conjunction with the president and vice president of administration. As described in the report, the scheduling and financing of campus maintenance projects requires ongoing coordination between the college's plant facilities office and the district office of facilities planning and development.

Recommendations 9 and 10 specifically addressed policies of the Board of Trustees. The chancellor's office developed the responses and disseminated them to the college. The accreditation liaison officer reviewed these responses with the president and vice presidents of student services and administrative services.

The report and all recommendations were reviewed and approved by the Educational Planning Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The report was also approved by the college senior staff composed of the president and vice presidents of academic affairs, student services and administrative services before submission to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

---

Robert Garber, President

---

Date

**Recommendation 5: The District should provide leadership in supporting the progress toward incorporating and achieving stated SLOs as a component of faculty evaluation. (Standard III.A.1.c.)**

The faculty evaluation process is addressed in the faculty contract approved by the AFT College Guild, Local 1521 and the Los Angeles Community College District. The faculty contract is being renegotiated this spring, and the issue of including student learning outcomes in the faculty evaluation process will be part of the initial proposal by administration to address in collective bargaining. However, both the college and the district took steps to move forward in addressing this recommendation in the context of collegial consultation and shared governance.

Three specific activities document that the college is substantially in compliance with this standard: the report of a districtwide Faculty Evaluation Taskforce that assessed the role of student learning outcomes under the current faculty contract and proposed self-assessment models for the colleges to consider shows district leadership; the creation and approval of a Pierce College Academic Senate resolution supporting the utilization of the student learning outcomes process in peer evaluation shows faculty leadership; and the incorporation of student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluations that were conducted in Fall 2007 shows that the college is implementing the requirements of the standard.

1. Los Angeles Community College Faculty Evaluation Taskforce

Anticipating the need to address this issue prior to the 2007 accreditation team visit, the district created a Faculty Evaluation Taskforce in spring 2006 to bring together members of the District Academic Senate and the AFT College Faculty Guild in order to provide the colleges with guidance in fulfilling this standard. The task force was comprised of the District Academic Senate president, two college Academic Senate presidents, two college senate members, three faculty guild chapter presidents, the guild's executive secretary, and the chancellor's liaison (currently the vice chancellor for institutional effectiveness). After reviewing the collective bargaining agreement and determining that its provisions did not preclude consideration of student learning outcomes in the evaluation process, the taskforce issued a report with several recommendations (5.1).

These recommendations involve a model for incorporating student learning outcomes in faculty evaluations by linking them to the long-term professional development goals of individual faculty. This approach "closes the loop" of institutional improvement by connecting faculty development activities to college-wide efforts to improve student learning.

The proposed model is designed to be used in the comprehensive evaluation process as defined in Article 19 of the AFT collective bargaining agreement, the more rigorous of the periodic faculty evaluation processes, which is based on "information derived from considerable structured data gathering under the supervision of a peer review committee." Within this model, the comprehensive evaluation process includes a self-evaluation component to provide faculty members an opportunity for serious reflection and goal

setting. This self-evaluation would offer a snapshot of the faculty member's professional development activities since the last major evaluation, an assessment of his/her contribution to campus-wide and departmental SLO assessment and improvement efforts, and a clear statement of future goals and action plans for improvement. Because faculty play such a central role in institutional improvement and student learning, these personal goals would support or link to overarching college goals and objectives, including goals established in the college's educational master plan and in departmental program review.

Within the proposed model, as faculty members reflect on their activities over the past six years and set future professional development goals, they would link these future plans for self improvement to areas identified at the college and departmental levels as needing improvement in relation to SLOs. So, for example, in response to an identified college-wide, departmental, or discipline-specific need to focus more attention to developing critical thinking competencies, a faculty member might elect to research critical thinking pedagogies in relation to his or her academic field, attend a conference on critical thinking and individual learning styles, develop a new critical thinking module for courses in his/her discipline, or design and conduct a workshop for professional development credit on the topic. Or, in response to an assessed need to strengthen "computational competencies" among students in the sciences, a biology instructor might set professional development goals that involve building more math problems into homework assignments, revising course outlines to include more computational content, or devoting some hours to service in the college's math tutorial lab. Linking professional development goals to assessed institution-wide and departmental student learning outcome needs would ensure that individual faculty members make a positive contribution to the ongoing improvement of student learning.

The model also requires that each faculty member submit a professional activity and growth report to the peer evaluation committee. This report could provide an overview of the faculty member's professional development activities and service to the department and college community since the last comprehensive evaluation. It would also include new professional development goals and action plans that reflect assessed needs relative to campus wide and departmental student learning outcomes. Specifically, the report would include:

- I. Professional Achievements -- a summary of the faculty member's activities in response to goals established in the last comprehensive evaluation, including notation of significant achievements and recognition
- II. Institutional Service – documentation of the faculty member's engagement in service to the college/district (e.g., standing committees, accreditation, etc.); to the department (departmental committees, Title 5 updates, etc.); to the campus community at large (sponsoring clubs, special events, etc.)
- III. Professional Development Activities -- documentation of professional development activities, e.g., conferences attended, continuing education, independent research and

reading, conference/workshop presentations or papers, membership and participation in professional organizations

IV. Professional Development Goals – the establishment of personal professional development goals, each of which may be linked to educational master plan and/or departmental program review goals (expanding access, enhancing student success, increasing transfer or vocational certifications, etc.) and to one or more assessed institutional “weaknesses” relative to student learning outcomes; included would be action plans and timelines for fulfillment over the next six years

The issue of incorporating SLOs into faculty evaluations is expected to be addressed during contract negotiations in the spring and summer of 2008. Until the collective bargaining agreement is finalized, the recommendations of the 2006 Faculty Evaluation Taskforce can only be adopted as a recommended “best practice” by each of the LACCD colleges at the local level. As specified in the taskforce’s final recommendations, the faculty at each college are encouraged to engage in vigorous dialogue on ways to institute these recommendations. These local discussions should be overseen by the college academic senates in consultation with the college faculty guild chapter.

## 2. Pierce College Academic Senate Resolution

On December 17, 2007 the Academic Senate passed a resolution supporting the inclusion of SLOs in the faculty evaluation process. This resolution formalized an ongoing campus discussion that was initiated by the Commission’s recommendation. The motion was drafted by the Academic Senate president, the Educational Planning Committee (a sub-committee of the Academic Senate), and the student learning outcomes faculty advisory team. The text of the motion follows:

WHEREAS: The Pierce College Academic Senate recognizes the full cycle of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) definition and assessment, and the utilization of assessment results as a systematic instrument for improving student learning and development.

WHEREAS: SLO assessment is a professional tool that assists individual faculty members, departments, and the entire college to assess how well students are attaining the expected learning and development outcomes in courses, programs and degrees.

WHEREAS: The accreditation standards and self-study validation team recommendations mandate evidence of “a faculty-driven assessment plan that includes systematic evaluation and integrated planning of student learning outcomes for all courses, certificates, programs and degrees,” as well as “progress toward incorporating and achieving SLOs as a component of faculty evaluation”

THEREFORE: The Academic Senate encourages the Pierce College faculty to be committed to:

1. the ongoing, collaborative process of defining SLOs, assessing student outcomes and utilizing the results to improve student learning;
2. the utilization of the SLO process as a means for professional growth and development through self-assessment, collegial dialogue, and peer evaluation.

### 3. Pierce College Faculty Evaluation Process for Fall 2007

Eighty-nine percent of the probationary faculty evaluations that were completed in Fall 2007 included student learning outcomes in the evaluation criteria. Faculty in several departments also began using student learning outcomes in the evaluation criteria for comprehensive evaluations of tenured faculty. This process will be expanded under the guidance of collective bargaining agreement interpretation and Academic Senate encouragement to cover all comprehensive evaluations of full-time faculty.

The vice president of academic affairs urged deans and department chairs to encourage faculty being evaluated to include information about their participation in the design and assessment of SLOs for their courses, and to describe their plans for future activities leading to improvement of student learning. This issue was discussed at the October 9, 2007 meeting of the Departmental Council, a committee of academic administrators and department chairs. The vice president reinforced this request through a memo sent to the deans and full-time faculty evaluation committee chairs on November 21, 2007 (5.2).

As part of the evaluation process, each committee must submit to the vice president a copy of the proposed evaluation plan for approval. During this process, the vice president returned to the committees any plans that did not include a request for SLO information with the request for modification. Although the committees retain the right to set the evaluation criteria, 25 of the 28 evaluations that were completed in the Fall of 2007 included a requirement that faculty members discuss their involvement in the creation and assessment of student learning outcomes, and any plans to improve future outcomes. Following are examples of language used in the evaluation plans:

- The art department requires that the instructor's self-evaluation should include a narrative detailing their "establishment, maintenance, and extent of participation with regard to SLOs."
- The nursing department specifies: "The committee will require the following from the instructor: A statement describing how student learning outcomes are implemented within the course(s) to guide instructional activities."
- The "business department probationary faculty members "will be evaluated based on the following criteria: 1. Overall quality of course syllabus, including student learning outcomes. . . 4. Relationship of exams to course content and student learning outcomes. . . 5. Relationship of outside assignments to student learning outcomes

The content and extent of responses to this requirement varied, depending on the length of service of the faculty member and the status of SLO development within the

department. Some of the faculty described departmental discussions related to SLO development in which they had participated, others provided syllabi in which the course SLOs were included, and others discussed assessments that were being planned or had been conducted and analyzed. For example, a life science instructor indicated in her self-evaluation, “I have a set of student learning outcomes (SLOs) that I wrote as a tenure-track faculty member at Ventura College. These SLOs are my first draft of SLOs for Microbiology 20 here at Pierce College. I anticipate working with the other Microbiology 20 instructors as we develop course SLOs. We are still in the SLO development stages, and I expect that when these are complete, we will move to the formal assessment stage.” Another instructor admitted her relative lack of experience in this area: “My formal experience with the student learning outcomes movement is limited. I am currently researching its history, and am working with department members on philosophy SLOs. I have enumerated SLOs and course objectives in some of my logic courses.” A more experienced faculty member, in the Spanish department, reported on the SLOs, assessment measures, expected results, and assessment results she created and analyzed for her Spanish 1, 2, and 3 courses. She also included a “short-term vision (2 – 4 years)” for the department for assessing student outcomes.

In total, 24 of the faculty being evaluated included information about their involvement in SLO development and assessment in their portfolios. At the request of the vice president, committees were asked to include an acknowledgement of the work done by the faculty member in relation to SLOs, and to make recommendations, as appropriate, for future activities in this area. Eighteen of the 28 committees referenced SLOs in their evaluation summaries and recommendations.

As the college continues to make progress in the number of courses and programs for which learning outcomes have been developed, expectations for faculty assessment of SLOs and utilization of assessment outcomes will also continue to rise.

## Evidence

5.1 LACCD Faculty Evaluation Taskforce report August 2006

5.2 Memorandum from vice president of academic affairs to evaluation committee chairs

**Recommendation 6: The College, in concert with the District, should develop a comprehensive long-term plan for addressing the backlog of deferred maintenance projects which, if left unattended, may compromise the quality of the student learning environment. (Standard III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b)**

Plant facilities maintains a master listing via a 5-year plan (Exhibit 1) of all scheduled maintenance project (SMP) type work. The 5-year plan is a living document that is updated once a year and throughout the year. The plant facilities department continuously evaluates the condition of the campus resulting in new SMP projects added to the 5-year plan. The district office of facilities planning and development has the responsibility to verify that all submitted projects from the college meet state guidelines for an SMP project. Should any of the projects not meet the guidelines the district office of facilities planning and development works with plant facilities to revise or remove the project from the five-year SMP plan. SMP projects should not be confused with capital outlay projects. Both types of projects are funded by the state but the dollar value of an SMP project may not exceed \$400,000. An example of a capital outlay project is the current request for state funding to build new horticulture facilities.

Over the past two years, the college has received funding and completed several SMP projects:

- Repair of Hazardous Walkways: (Trip Hazardous & ADA Compliance)
- Backflow Device Replacement: (Code compliance)
- Campus Clock-System Replacement: (Replacement of old non-functioning clock system.)
- Renovations of 30 Classrooms: (Construction period was one month)
- Greenhouse Glass Replacement: (Replacement of all broken glass panels)
- Roof Replacements for Geography and Anthropology Buildings.

The State of California no longer approves specific projects and funding for the projects. It simply provides funding in the form of a block grant to the district. The state funding is not made available to the district until the legislature passes a budget and the governor signs it. Once the district has received notification of the amount of the block grant, the executive director of facilities planning and development recommends an allocation to the Board of Trustees using a formula based on the assignable square feet (ASF) and the full time equivalent students (FTEs) of each college. After the Board of Trustees has accepted and approved the recommendation the executive director of facilities planning and development will notify each college how much funding is available for its SMP projects for the current fiscal year (Exhibit 2).

The plant facilities department prepares the annual 5-year SMP plan every December. The 5-year SMP plan breaks the projects into five categories: roof, utilities, mechanical, exterior, and other. An integral part of the plan is the prioritized project list for the upcoming fiscal year. The initial priorities are recommended by the director of college facilities to the college president and senior staff; the project priorities are ranked by life/safety issues, age of buildings or infrastructure, and program disruption possibilities.

The presentation of the plan includes discussion of the estimated budgets for each of the anticipated projects for a full five years. Once there is consensus on the projects and the priorities the 5-year SMP plan is submitted to district office of facilities planning and development.

Upon notification by the district executive director of facilities planning and development, the director of college facilities will submit a revised recommendation to the president, senior staff, and the Pierce College Council (college planning and budget committee) of the project(s) on a prioritized list to be funded for the upcoming fiscal year. Once there is consensus among these groups the director of college facilities notifies the district office of facilities planning and development about which projects will go into production. The district office of facilities planning and development takes this information and enters it into Fusion (State Chancellor's Facility Database), thereby notifying the state what project(s) the college will undertake.

The college can directly manage any SMP project with a budget up to \$130,000; a district project manager must manage SMP projects that exceed \$130,000. In the past the district office of facilities planning and development had project managers on their staff and they were assigned the project work. In the current environment outside firms manage all of the Proposition A/AA bond-funded construction projects at each campus. Pierce College has retained Swinerton Management and Consulting as our college project manager (CPM), and the CPM is required by the district to act as the district project manager for any SMP project exceeding \$130,000.

The college and the district rely on the state to subsidize SMP projects. Most of this funding is at 50% of the estimated budget. The college is required to match the 50% funding level from the state, although the state awarded a one-time block grant for 2006-07 that did not require any matching funds from the college regardless of the type of SMP project. In recent years Pierce College has use bond funds for the match. In 2005, when construction costs increased dramatically, the college used unrestricted college funds for its matching contribution. The state does not require any matching funds from the college for hazardous substance removal projects.

Because of the limited resources of the college, many projects do not receive funding in the fiscal year requested. These projects are reevaluated, re-estimated, reprioritized, and resubmitted in the next 5-year SMP plan. If there is a pressing need to pursue an SMP project in a fiscal year for which no funding is currently available from the state, the director of college facilities will make a recommendation for college funding. Such a request will be submitted to senior staff, the college budget committee, and its parent committee, the Pierce College Council, which ultimately makes a recommendation to the president.

The cooperation between the college and the district office on long-term planning for both scheduled maintenance and capital outlay shows the college to be in compliance with the standard.

**EXHIBIT 1 – PROJECTS IN 5-YEAR SMP PLAN**

<b>Fiscal Year of Funding</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Estimated Repair/ Replacement Cost</b>	<b>Notes</b>
2007-08	Water - Irrigation Line Replacement PAB/Music/Fine Arts Hill	\$399,750	<b>Funded</b>
2008-09	Gas Line Replacement - Horticulture	\$101,475	
2008-09	Remove & Replace Trees creating trip hazards, repair trip hazards	\$383,760	
2008-09	Replace and increase campus exterior lighting	\$369,000	
2008-09	HVAC Tutoring Office Lab/LRC/Office [Grill Room]	\$246,000	Building status is in question. Might be demolished to make way for new Library and Food Court
2010-11	Replace & Repair benches campus wide	\$307,500	Coordinate with Bond Projects
2009-10	Sewer & Storm Drain Replacement - Campus Wide	\$399,750	
2009-10	Campus Center Roof	\$104,550	
2009-10	Life Science Roof	\$108,240	Coordinate with Bond Projects
2009-10	Replace/Repave Stadium Way and Parking Lot # 4	\$393,600	
2009-10	Industrial Tech Roof	\$172,200	
2009-10	Drafting Roof	\$123,984	
2009-10	Water - Irrigation Various Campus Locations	\$399,750	
2010-11	Repair/Replace Farm Fencing	\$129,575	
2010-11	Replace/Repave Pepper Tree Lane & Farm Roads	\$360,000	
2011-12	HVAC Administration Building	\$276,750	Coordinate with Bond Projects
2012-13	HVAC Campus Wide Upgrade/Repairs	\$338,250	Coordinate with Bond Projects

## **EXHIBIT 2 – FUNDING NOTICE**

**LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Facilities Planning and Development Department  
Inter-Office Correspondence**

---

DATE : October 23, 2007

TO : Vice Presidents, Administration  
Directors of College Facilities

FROM : Larry H. Eisenberg  
Executive Director

SUBJECT : **REQUEST FOR 2007-08 SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE AND  
SPECIAL REPAIRS DOCUMENTS**

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Please submit (a) the 2007-08 PFP-Project Funding Proposals (241/SM/PFP), (b) the 2007-08 PFP-Project Funding Proposals (241/HSRP/PFP), (c) the 2007-12 Five-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan Summary, (d) the District 5-Year Plans for Roof, Utility, Mechanical, Exterior and Other Repairs or Replacement, and (e) the List of your Prioritized SMP Projects **on or before November 8, 2007.**

**BACKGROUND/SUMMARY:**

The 2007 Budget Act (SB 77, Ch. 171) splits the allocation to the California Community College Districts of the on-going block grants into two separate allocations that cannot be used interchangeably. One is for physical plant repair and the other is for instructional support. The allocation for our district is **\$1,118,803 for physical plant repair** and \$1,118,702 for instructional support. Also, the 2007 Budget Act (SB 77, Ch. 171) includes a one-time block grant allocation to California Community College Districts, that which each district has the flexibility to use the grant for scheduled maintenance and special repairs, architectural barrier removal, seismic repairs, hazardous substances, instructional equipment and library materials. **The one-time block grant allocated to our district is \$616,919.** In following with last year's distribution, this year's grants are proposed to be allocated to the colleges based on the combination of 50% FTES and 50% ASFs (**See enclosed Exhibit I**). In addition, one of the provisions of the 2007 Budget Act (SB 77, Ch. 171) requires that a district submit Project Funding Proposals for on-going block grants for physical plant and the one-time block grant for scheduled maintenance and hazardous substance projects. Submittal of the Project Funding Proposals for architectural barrier removal and seismic repairs are not required.

The 2007-08 distribution of the On-Going Block Grant for Physical Plant and the One-Time Block Grant to our colleges are as follows:

- 1 -

**EXHIBIT 2 – FUNDING NOTICE (CONT.)**

College	On-Going Block Grant for Physical Plant State Dollars	One-Time Block Grant State Dollars
City	\$151,901	\$83,759
East	\$203,859	\$112,410
Harbor	\$81,212	\$44,781
Mission	\$55,360	\$30,526
Pierce	\$162,311	\$89,500
Southwest	\$73,589	\$40,578
Trade-Tech	\$157,898	\$87,067
Valley	\$143,989	\$79,397
West	\$88,684	\$48,901
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,118,803</b>	<b>\$616,919</b>

Local matching is required, applicable to both On-Going and One-Time Grants as follows:

- Scheduled Maintenance Projects 1:1 (50% State / 50% local match)
- Architectural Barrier Removal Projects 1:1 (50% State / 50% local match)
- Seismic Repair & Hazardous Substance Removal Projects NO MATCH – 100% State
- Instructional Equipment 3:1 (75% State/ 25% local match)
- Library Materials 3:1 (75% State/25% local match)

Please refer to enclosed **Exhibit II** to determine the 100% costs (State and Local Match) of the projects, **assuming** the On-Going Block Grants for Physical Plant and the One-Time Block Grants will be used to fund Scheduled Maintenance and Architectural Barrier Projects.

Since Education Code 84660 requires that each District submits a Five-Year Plan for Scheduled Maintenance annually, the Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges mandates that each district inputs to the State FUSION system its Five-Year Plan for Scheduled Maintenance to receive funding. Enclosed are the following forms for the 2007-08 Scheduled Maintenance and Special Repairs Project for your use and submittal to our office, in order for us to comply with the requirements of Education Code 84660:

- a) 2007-08 PFP-Project Funding Proposal (241/SM/PFP);
- b) 2007-08 PFP-Project Funding Proposal (241/HSRP/PFP);
- c) 2007-12 Five-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan Summary;
- d) District 5-Year Plan for Roof Repair or Replacement;
- e) District 5-Year Plan for Utility Repair or Replacement;
- f) District 5-Year Plan for Mechanical Equipment Repair or Replacement;
- g) District 5-Year Plan for Exterior Refinishing and Repair;
- h) District 5-Year Plan for Other Critical Needs; and
- i) Prioritized List of 2007-08 SMP Projects.

**Recommendation 9: The Board of Trustees should complete the self-evaluation process by discussing and developing a set of Board goals to respond to any issues identified in its self-evaluation. The Board should institutionalize the goal-setting and measuring of accomplishments as part of the self-evaluation process. (Standard IV.B.1.g)**

To respond to this ACCJC concern, the Board of Trustees adopted a board rule on October 17, 2007 that established the setting of board goals as part of its annual process of self-evaluation (9.1). As it does in the Fall of every year, the Board conducts a self evaluation on 20 general areas and scores its performance (9.2). At a committee of the whole meeting on December 19, 2007 (9.3), the Board reviewed its annual self evaluation in open session and made overall comments (9.4). At its January 30, 2008 meeting, the Board established a new set of annual board goals (9.5). The 2008 goals are:

Access: Expand Educational Opportunity and Access

1. Increase outreach to communities and groups that have been historically underserved by higher education (such as African Americans, Latino males, etc.) to increase college awareness and participation.
2. Encourage the development of programs meant to connect the “disengaged” and those at risk of becoming disengaged with productive educational pathways.

Success: Enhance all Measures of Student Success

3. Support the development and implementation of district-wide strategies aimed at increasing student success outcomes.

Excellence: Support Student Learning and Educational Excellence

4. Foster the development of new career/technical educational programs that are designed to provide area residents with economically sustainable jobs and that lead to future educational and career options.
5. Encourage the development of green educational degree and certificate programs that complement the district’s award-winning bond building efforts.

Accountability: Foster a District-wide Culture of Service and Accountability

6. Continue the district-wide dialogue on decentralization and further clarify the division of roles and responsibilities between the colleges and the district office.
7. Require regular reports to the Board of Trustees on college and district efforts to implement the goals and objectives in the district strategic plan.
8. Monitor the effectiveness of efforts at the colleges and the district office that are meant to foster a district-wide culture of customer “service and accountability.”
9. Support the implementation of a district-wide recycling program.

Collaboration & Resources: Explore New Resources and External Partnerships

10. Forward legislative initiatives intended to increase college access, stabilize college funding, and reduce unnecessary red-tape.
11. Continue to address the physical and capital needs of the district.

In the Fall of 2008, the Board will again assess its progress in accomplishing its goals as part of its self-evaluation process and will set new goals for the following year.

The board rule and the completion of the board goals show the college to be in compliance with the accreditation standard.

Evidence

9.1 Board Rule 2301.10

9.2 Board Self-Evaluation 2007

9.3 Minutes of the December 19, 2007 BOT meeting

9.4 Board Evaluation Comments

9.5 Minutes of the January 30, 2008 BOT meeting

**Recommendation 10: Although in practice the evaluation of the college presidents and district chancellor occurs on a regular basis and is an inclusive process, the team recommends that the District develop a written policy that clearly defines the evaluation process. (Standard IV.B.1.j)**

To address this ACCJC recommendation in reference to the evaluation of college presidents, the district HR division drafted a formal written policy, the Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents (10.1), which clearly spells out the evaluation process that has been and continues to be followed. The description is now included in the packet with the evaluation forms that are used (10.2).

The current process for the evaluation of college presidents has been in place since 2002 and was originally developed by the former senior vice chancellor/interim chancellor. The process was continued by Chancellor Rocky Young, and our current Chancellor, Dr. Mark Drummond, has no immediate plans to make any changes. The presidential evaluation process is facilitated by the chancellor's office. The procedure is followed each spring with about three presidents undergoing the comprehensive process each year.

To address this ACCJC recommendation in reference to the chancellor's evaluation process, the chancellor's office issued a directive that spells out the procedure that has been and continues to be followed (10.3). The Board, using the general counsel as staff, conducts the evaluation of the chancellor, whose contract includes a provision for an annual evaluation. Each year, the Board reviews its previous evaluation and directs the general counsel regarding the process for the current year. In most years, the Board solicits input from various constituencies, typically including the college presidents, district senior staff, the academic senate presidents, and union representatives. To achieve this, the general counsel's office sends out a data collection form (10.4) to evaluate the chancellor's performance on a number of criteria and elicit comments, which are submitted anonymously. Postcards are sent to confirm that these forms have been received. All of this material is provided to the trustees.

The chancellor typically prepares a written self-evaluation based upon his stated goals, which is given to the Board.

The trustees submit their own appraisals on an evaluation form (10.5). These are collected and sent to a designated trustee for summarization or to the general counsel for consolidation. The trustees then discuss the matter in closed session, and a designated trustee prepares a final draft for the full Board's review. The trustees then meet with the chancellor and provide the final written document.

The new policy on evaluation of chancellor and college presidents and its implementation show the college to be in compliance with the accreditation standard.

## Evidence

- 10.1 Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents
- 10.2 Presidential Evaluation Packet
- 10.3 Chancellor's Directive #122 on chancellor evaluation
- 10.4 Chancellor Evaluation Data Collection
- 10.5 Chancellor Evaluation form

**Commission Concern 2: The College will need to undergo a site visit of its recently approved Program for Accelerated College Education (PACE) at two off-campus sites: Beaudry-Shatto and Kennedy High School as mandated by federal guidelines which require such a visit within six months after program implementation. This visit will be scheduled for September, 2007.**

The ACCJC took action at its June 6-8, 2007, meeting to approve the Program for Accelerated College Education (PACE) at two off-campus sites: Beaudry-Shatto and Kennedy High School. Mr. Jack Pond, ACCJC Vice President, conducted the required site visits to Beaudry-Shatto on September 11, and to Kennedy High School on September 12, 2007. The visits were positive and no concerns were expressed or change recommendations made to Los Angeles Pierce College.

Review of Progress Report by the Board of Trustees

The Los Angeles Pierce College Progress Report has been reviewed and approved by the members of the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees on February 27, 2008

---

Sylvia Scott-Hayes, President

---

Date