EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Pasadena City College

1570 East Colorado Boulevard

Pasadena, California 91106-2003

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

This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
Pasadena City College on March 2, 2015 through March 5, 2015.

Kathryn G. Smith, Chair

Visiting Team Members

Kathryn G. Smith (Chair)
President/Superintendent
College of the Redwoods

Tracey Thomas (Assistant)
Dean, Math, Science & Social Sciences
College of the Redwoods

Dr. Janet Fulks
Interim Dean of Student Success
Bakersfield College

Kerry Mayer
Professor, Communication Studies
College of the Redwoods

Duncan Graham
Vice President, Instruction
San Jose City College

Dr. Cheryl Marshall
President
Crafton Hills College

Dr. Dulce Gray
Instructor, English
West Valley College

Saundra McGlothlin
Vice President of Student Services
West Hills College Lemoore

Dr. Frank Kobayashi
Dean, Natomas Education Center
American River College

Rebecca Tillberg
Dean, Research & Planning
West Los Angeles College

Dr. Andrew LaManque
Associate Vice President of Instruction
Foothill College

Gary Whitfield
Vice President, Administrative Services
Columbia College

Sue Loring
Counselor
Shasta College

Summary of the Report

INSTITUTION: Pasadena City College

DATE OF VISIT: March 2, 2015 through March 5, 2015

TEAM CHAIR: Kathryn G. Smith
                    President/Superintendent, College of the Redwoods

A team of thirteen professional educators visited Pasadena City College (PCC) March 2-5, 2015 for the purpose of evaluating whether the College meets ACCJC Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements and Commission Policies. This report is presented to make recommendations to the College regarding compliance with Standards, Eligibility Requirements and Policies, quality assurance and increasing institutional effectiveness, and to make a recommendation to the Commission regarding the College's accreditation status.

The visiting team members prepared in advance of the visit by attending team trainings, reviewing the College's Self Evaluation Report, inspecting evidence provided by the College electronically, and preparing a draft report of their observations and findings based upon review of the Self Evaluation Report and evidence. Their preparations also included compiling a list of College employees and constituent groups with whom team members would like to meet, and a list of additional evidentiary documents that they wished to review during the on-site visit.

The visiting team found the Superintendent/President, the faculty, the staff, and the students at Pasadena City College to be very responsive and accommodating. The College facilities were appropriate for our team, and the team work room was conveniently located and comfortable. The College also arranged for a team work room at the hotel, which was used each day for team meetings and as a place for team members to work together in the evenings.

The team initially met on the afternoon of Monday, March 2, in the team work room at the hotel. Following the meeting, the team members participated in a tour of the Pasadena City College campus, preparing the team for the visit to take place on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. On Tuesday morning, a general "meet-and-greet" took place on campus where the team was introduced to faculty, staff, administrators and members of the Board of Trustees. For the remainder of Tuesday and all day Wednesday, team members met with over 300 faculty, staff and students in various meetings and interviews. Two open forums were offered to all college constituents, giving them the opportunity to bring questions or concerns forward to the team members. Three team members traveled to the Rosemead Campus and two team members visited the Community Education Center.

On Wednesday evening, the team held a lengthy review of the collective evidence and engaged in thoughtful conversation regarding the recommendations that should be made to the Commission and what evidence still needed to be reviewed on Thursday, the team's final day on campus. On Thursday morning, after a final review of evidence and final rewrite of various report sections, the team met one last time to confirm the areas for recommendations and commendations. At 11:30 on Thursday, March 5, 2015, the exit forum was held with about 80

employees and students in attendance. The team chair summarized the team report and the recommendations that would be forwarded to the Commission.

The entire visit was well organized and collegial. College employees were enthusiastically engaged in the work of educating and serving students. It was clear that the College places a high priority on engaging students both in their studies and in the life and governance of the College. The team was well received and was able to complete its scheduled review.

While the College has made significant progress in many of the recommendations from its last comprehensive review in 2009, concerns remain about its planning and governance processes. This report describes the team's concerns in detail and makes recommendations on how the College can continue its progress to meet the Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements.

Introduction

Pasadena City College was founded in 1924 and established as the Pasadena Area Community College District (PACCD) in 1966. The single-college district is governed by an elected seven-member Board of Trustees and is geographically located in the western San Gabriel Valley of Los Angeles County. The College's main campus has 30 buildings on a 53 acre site located at 1570 East Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena. A satellite campus, the Community Education Center, located at 3025 East Foothill Boulevard in Pasadena, primarily houses the District's noncredit programs. The Rosemead Center, located at 4105 North Rosemead Boulevard in Rosemead, offers a variety of high demand courses and counseling services to students in the service area. The College also operates a Child Development Center, located two blocks to the west of the main campus at 1324 East Green Street. Pasadena City College offers a comprehensive selection of distance, hybrid and telecommunications courses.

The College enrolls over 25,000 credit and about 5,000 noncredit students annually. Approximately 68 percent of the enrollment is drawn from outside the District's boundaries, including out-of-state and international students. PCC sustains a diverse student body with over 40 percent of the total student population of Latino heritage. As of fall 2014, the College employs 361 tenured and tenure-track full-time faculty, 26 classified managers, 17 classified supervisors, 25 academic managers, 362 classified support employees, and 1083 adjunct faculty.

Since the last comprehensive accreditation team visit in 2009, PCC has had two permanent Superintendent/Presidents and two interims. The College is currently in the search process for its next Superintendent/President. In addition to the upheaval in the Superintendent/President's Office, PCC has experienced several reorganizations during the past six years, and many of the senior level positions have turned over, are currently vacant, or are filled with interim placements.

As a result of the comprehensive team visit in March 2009, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (Commission) took action to issue a "Warning" to PCC, and require two follow-up reports and visits. After the two follow-up reports and visits in March 2010 and October 2010, the Commission took action to remove Warning and reaffirm accreditation. The College submitted its Midterm Report in 2012 and its Self Evaluation Report in 2015. The current team visit and this report are in response to the College's most recent Self Evaluation Report.

Commendations

Commendation #1
The team commends Pasadena City College (PCC) for its commitment to student success, as demonstrated by its innovative pathways programs, such as Design Technology and the First Year Experience Pathways Programs, by support services for veterans, and by the Graduation Initiative.

Commendation #2
The team commends the College for its excellent facilities, including the recently constructed Campus Center, Industrial Technologies Building, and PCC Center for the Arts.

Commendation #3
The team commends the College for its efforts to provide an inclusive environment for students of diverse backgrounds. Through its mission, core values, general education outcomes (GEOs), Cross-Cultural Center, clubs and activities, support for special programs, advisory committees, and most recently, its efforts to locate a Veterans Affairs Health Center on campus, the College demonstrates its ongoing commitment to the needs and welfare of all its students.

Commendation #4
The team commends the College's Distance Learning Program for its success in preparing faculty to teach courses online. Its design and delivery of rigorous requirements (including completion of four courses through @One's Online Certification Program and a semester-long in-house training program), and its design and implementation of the Model Course Program, have allowed the Distance Learning Program to increase its distance learning courses and maintain course quality in compliance with the Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education.

Commendation #5
The team commends the College for its active library and learning support services. The number of students utilizing the library and the LAC, the multiple on-campus tutoring labs, a nationally recognized tutor training program, anytime/anywhere access to a reference librarian and to tutoring services, and students' high rating of these services demonstrate PCC's sound commitment to supporting student learning.

Commendation #6
The team commends the College for its integration of the Child Development Center with instruction and workforce development. The Child Development Center serves over 120 children through its high quality infants to early primary program and functions as a laboratory for students across disciplines. Recently, the College was awarded a Workforce Initiative Grant from the Los Angles Universal Preschool, enabling the College to provide focused child development academic counseling, career services, and financial support to child development majors.

Recommendations to Meet Standards

Recommendation #1
In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendations #1 and #2 (2009), the team recommends that the College systematically evaluate and improve all of its planning processes, including full integration of program review (instructional, student services, and administrative services) into the planning processes, and the use of program review and the planning processes to determine the allocation of resources and to make decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.6; I.B.7; II.A.2.e and f; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.4 and Eligibility Requirement 19)

Recommendation #2
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College create and implement a plan to ensure the regular evaluation of all employees based upon intervals consistent with College policies. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Recommendation #3
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College standardize its performance evaluation process for adjunct faculty, and that the College include assessment of student learning outcomes in its performance evaluations of adjunct faculty, staff, and management employees who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Recommendation #4
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College constituents follow their approved codes of ethics and that all constituent groups embrace and demonstrate compliance with Board Policy 2715-Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, AP 3050-Professional Ethics of Faculty, AP 3060-Professional Ethics of Management, and AP 3070-Professional Ethics of Classified Staff. (Standards III.A.1.d; III.A.3; III.A.4.c; IV.A and IV.B.1.e and h)

Recommendation #5
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College focus on stabilizing its administrative organizational structure and complete the selection processes to fill the interim, acting and vacant administrative positions with permanent appointments. (Standard III.A.2; Eligibility Requirement 5)

Recommendation #6
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College, through participatory governance, develop and implement a comprehensive, coordinated professional development program for all personnel, regularly assess the effectiveness of the program, and use the assessment results as the basis for continuous improvement. (Standards III.A.5.a and b)

Recommendation #7
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that institutional leaders use transparent participatory processes; follow Board policies for soliciting input from all constituent groups for institutional decision making; and model collegial communication specifically among the Board, President and Academic Senate, for the goal of working together to demonstrate an environment of empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence for the good of the institution. (Standards IV.A.1; IV.A.3 and IV.B.1.e)

Recommendation #8
In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendation #6 (2009), the team recommends that the institution regularly and systematically evaluates organization structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness, communicates those evaluations to the College, and uses the results of those evaluations as a basis for improvement. (Standard IV.A.5).

Recommendations to Improve Institutional Effectiveness

Recommendation #9
In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that all Student Affairs departments and service programs conduct annual outcomes assessments, and that a regular program review cycle be clearly established and communicated to all student service programs. (Standard II.B.4)

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to
Previous Recommendations (2009)

2009 Recommendation #1
The team recommends that the College develop a systematic assessment of evaluation mechanisms, i.e., program review and planning processes, to determine their effectiveness in improving student learning programs and services and administrative functions. Specifically, the College needs to implement a consistent data set for program review and process improvement (IB.6, IB.7)

In response to the 2009 recommendation, the College developed comprehensive data sets that are used in the program review process. However, program review and institutional planning are not done on an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integration with resource allocation, and re-evaluation in order to improve institutional effectiveness.

See Recommendation #1 in this 2015 team report.

2009 Recommendation #2
The team recommends that the College expand its assessment of student learning outcomes to include all programs, degrees, and certificates, and, if applicable, learning and support service areas. The team further recommends that the student learning outcomes assessment be incorporated into the program review; program planning, and resource allocation processes. (IB, IIA.2.e, and IIA.2.f, IIB, IIC)

Student learning outcomes have been identified in all courses and programs but are currently not assessed in 100 percent of courses and programs. The team examined evidence showing that SLO assessment work included dialogue and resulted in improvement in a variety of credit and non-credit programs, such as High School Diploma, Fashion, English, Accounting Clerk and Anthropology. This assessment work included rigorous review and feedback from a review committee for many programs, including Accounting Clerk, Anesthesia, ESL and Geography. SLO assessment is an integral part of departmental and unit program reviews, but program reviews are not consistently integrated into the institutional planning and resource allocation processes.

See Recommendation #1 in this 2015 team report.

2009 Recommendation #3
The team recommends that the College establish and implement policies and procedures that define and ensure the quality and integrity of the distance education offerings and make these policies widely available to faculty. The institution must also submit a Substantive Change Proposal to the Commission. (IIA.1; IIA.1b)

The 2015 visiting team confirmed that the College has addressed this recommendation by developing policies and procedures for Distance Education (DE), including DE faculty training, that undergo rigorous development and approval processes. The Distance Education

policies and procedures are published in the College's DE Faculty Handbook and on the DE webpage. Also available on the DE webpage is the Substantive Change Proposal to Offer at Least 50 Percent of Course Units for Programs through Distance Education, approved by the Commission in 2012.

2009 Recommendation #4
The team recommends that the College ensure that performance evaluations for classified employees are completed on a timely basis, and that evaluations for adjunct faculty are stored in Human Resources Department office to ensure personnel file security of sensitive information and confidentiality. (IIIA.1.b)

The team's review of a random selection of personnel files revealed that a substantial number of employee performance evaluations are not up-to-date and do not meet the requirements of Board policy. The evaluations of adjunct faculty were moved to the Human Resources Department Office, but remain unfiled and in boxes, making it difficult to access files as needed.

See Recommendation #2 in this 2015 team report.

2009 Recommendation #5
The team recommends that the College develop codes of ethics for management and classified employees (IIIA.1.d)

This recommendation was met; the College did develop codes of ethics for all employee classifications. However, the team found that these codes of ethics, as formally outlined in Board policy and procedures, are not consistently followed by all College personnel and by all members of the Board of Trustees.

See Recommendation #4 in this 2015 team report.

2009 Recommendation #6
The team recommends the College develop and implement formal process for the regular evaluation of each component of its governance and decision-making structures and use results for improvement as needed (IVA.5).

The College has not resolved the deficiencies cited in this recommendation. Board policies and procedures are in place to define the roles of constituent groups in the participatory governance process, and Board policies and procedures are in place to support institutional improvement and effectiveness. However, the systematic and ongoing implementation of those policies and procedures is not fully realized, resulting in a dysfunctional campus climate where participatory governance is not respected or actualized. Residual mistrust, unprofessional behavior, and a lack of civility still permeates through and among faculty and administration; however, through interviews with constituent groups there is a sense of optimism that the environment on campus is changing.

See Recommendation #8 in this 2015 team report.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority
The visiting team confirmed that Pasadena City College is a public two year community college operating under the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community College System, and the Board of Trustees of the Pasadena Community College District. Pasadena City College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The College's letter of Reaffirmation of Accreditation from the ACCJC is posted on the College's website.

2. Mission
The visiting team confirmed that the current version of the mission statement for Pasadena City College was approved by the Board of Trustees on June 2, 2010 (Board Policy 0200). The mission statement describes the College's educational mission and student population with a focus on students from "communities within the District service area." The mission statement includes an emphasis on student learning and is available on the College's website and in the College catalog.

3. Governing Board
The visiting team confirmed that the governing board (Board of Trustees) of Pasadena City College is responsible for the quality, integrity, financial stability of the institution and for ensuring the College achieves its mission. The seven members represent constituents from identified geographic areas of the District. The Board adheres to an established conflict of interest policy and has demonstrated impartiality in matters pertaining to the academic and financial integrity of the College.

4. Chief Executive Officer
The visiting team confirmed that Pasadena City College has a Chief Executive Officer appointed by the Board who serves as the Superintendent/President. Through board policy, the CEO has the appropriate delegated authority to administer Board policies. Changes in this position are duly reported to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).

5. Administrative Capacity
The visiting team was unable to positively confirm that the institution has sufficient numbers of staff and administrators necessary to provide the administrative services required to support the institution's mission. The institution has a number of administrative positions that are either vacant or that are filled by personnel in an interim/acting capacity. Some of these interim appointments extend beyond the College's own administrative procedure (AP 7250), which limits interim appointments to 18-months and, in some cases extend beyond what is permissible under Title 5 regulations. There is evidence to support that the College's practice of engaging in multiple reorganizations over the last three to four years, of making interim appointments that extend beyond the permitted time frame, and of moving personnel from one interim position to another has had deleterious effects on employee evaluation practices

and has led to confusion of roles, structures, and responsibilities institution-wide. See Recommendation #5 in this 2015 team report.

6. Operational Status
The visiting team confirmed that Pasadena City College has been in continuous operation since its inception and continues to provide quality service. The operational status of the College is documented by the College fact book, *Observations*, which contains enrollment history, counts of students who have transferred to four-year universities, and counts of degrees and certificates awarded. This information can be verified through records available at the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

7. Degrees
The visiting team confirmed that a significant proportion of students at Pasadena City College are enrolled in a substantial portion of the educational offerings (35 academic and 75 career and technical program areas, most of them of at least two academic years in length) leading to degrees and certificates of completion. The College also offers lifelong learning programs.

In accordance with California Title 5 and recommendations made by the California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force, students at Pasadena City College must identify a program of study (certificate, degree, or transfer objective) in the term after which they complete 15 semester units.

8. Educational Programs
The visiting team confirmed that the College's degree programs are consistent with its mission and are of sufficient content, length and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered. Student learning outcomes have been identified and, although not assessed in 100 percent of courses and programs, are in the process of being assessed, with dialogue and improvement observable in a variety of programs.

9. Academic Credit
The visiting team confirmed that Pasadena City College awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education. The team reviewed course outlines of record and a sample of course syllabi to compare course requirements with academic credit awarded.

10. Student Learning and Achievement
The visiting team confirmed that the programs and courses offered by Pasadena City College via various modes of instruction are consistent in requirements and rigor. The College has developed student learning outcomes (SLOs) for all of its courses and programs, and established institution-set standards for student achievement through the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and in career and technical education (CTE) programs. These standards and their respective targets have not been widely communicated or discussed; however, procedures are being established to include review of the standards and targets in the program review process.

11. General Education
The visiting team confirmed that the general education requirements at Pasadena City College encourage students to explore different areas of human inquiry not only to gain a basic understanding of these areas, but also to comprehend and use the principles, methods, values and thought processes of these disciplines. Through completion of the general education requirements, graduates obtain the skills, knowledge, and insights to evaluate and appreciate the physical environment, culture, and society. Students graduating with associate's degrees from PCC achieve these comprehensive learning outcomes:
- Communication: Use creative expression to communicate acquired knowledge or skills effectively.
- Cognition: Use critical thinking skills to observe, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate ideas and information.
- Information Competency: Use research and technical skills effectively and ethically to achieve an objective.
- Social Responsibility: Demonstrate sensitivity to and respect for others.
- Personal Development: Demonstrate an understanding of practices that promote physical, psychological, and emotional well-being.

12. Academic Freedom
The visiting team confirmed that Board Policy 3100-Academic Freedom guarantees an atmosphere of free inquiry and expression for faculty, students, classified, administrators, and trustees.

13. Faculty
The visiting team confirmed that full-time and part-time faculty at Pasadena City College meets or exceeds the minimum qualifications or its equivalent set by the Office of the Chancellor of California Community Colleges. The number of faculty is sufficient to support the College's programs, and as of fall 2014, Pasadena City College employs 361 full-time and 1,083 part-time faculty. The faculty and their credentials are listed in the College catalog. The responsibilities of a faculty member are detailed in the collective bargaining contract between the District and the Faculty Association.

14. Student Services
The visiting team confirmed that the College supports the learning and success of its students by offering an array of student services that are delivered through various methods on campus and online, in addition to a selective range of services at its offsite centers in Rosemead and the Community Education Center (CEC).   At all locations, student support services are staffed with dedicated personnel who serve a large population of student enrollment.

15. Admissions
The visiting team confirmed that clear, accessible, and consistent admissions policies are publicized online, in the College catalog, in the schedule of classes, and in Board policies.

16. Information and Learning Resources
The visiting team confirmed that Pasadena City College provides access to information and learning resources and services to support its students and instructional programs regardless of location and instructional delivery mode.

17. Financial Resources
The visiting team confirmed that the College has a funding base and financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The College has sufficient financial resources for long-term stability and to improve institutional effectiveness.

18. Financial Accountability
The visiting team confirmed that the College annually undergoes and makes available its external financial audits. The team reviewed the audits for the prior two years. The team did confirm that the College has been able to balance its budget and maintain an adequate reserve in spite of the statewide economic recession.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation
The visiting team confirmed that the College is working toward developing an integrated cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation which is centered on program review. The College has connected SLO assessment and evaluation with the program review process; however, the visiting team found that integration of planning and evaluation with resource allocation and decision making are not fully realized. See Recommendation #1 in this 2015 team report.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public
The visiting team confirmed that the mission and goals of the College; course, program, and degree offerings; admissions requirements; fees and refund policies; requirements for degrees, certificates, graduation, and transfer; academic credentials of faculty and administrators; names of Board members; major policies; and related items are published in the catalog, class schedule, and also posted on the website.

21. Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission
The visiting team confirmed that the elected Board members and the Superintendent/ President are committed to integrity and transparency in their relations with the Accrediting Commission. The institution complies with Commission requests and directives, and prepares complete and accurate reports for submission to the Commission.

Compliance with Commission Policies

Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education

The College adheres to state and federal regulations and ACCJC policies regarding Distance Education (DE). The College's Substantive Change Proposal to Offer at Least 50 percent of Course Units for Programs through Distance Education was approved by the Commission in June 2012. DE courses are required to meet learning outcomes of the course and to undergo a separate review and approval process by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (C&I). Success and retention data for DE courses are compared to the face-to-face courses in the program review process. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment for DE courses is used to monitor synthesis of learning and is completed and discussed among appropriate discipline faculty on an annual basis; outcomes are reported in the Annual Assessment Report.

The College trains its DE faculty members in the specifics of designing and teaching DE courses. A Faculty Handbook with resources, policies, and best practices for DE is available for instructors. Resources are provided to students to make certain that the experience in DE courses is equivalent to that of face-to-face courses. The Academic Senate's DE Committee focuses on policies for online instruction.

The College has processes in place to address student authentication. The College uses the Canvas learning management system (LMS), which requires that students log in using college-assigned and password protected credentials; this process assists instructors in recognizing the individual work of students. Board Policy (BP) 3230-Distance Education states that all course communication, assignments, and interactions must be conducted through the Canvas LMS.

The College is in compliance with ACCJC policies regarding distance education and correspondence education.

Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status

The Pasadena City College catalog was redesigned in 2009 by counseling faculty and staff. It presents information in a logical, easy-to-use format. It contains all necessary material, including general information, requirements, and major policies affecting students. The catalog is updated every fall semester, providing current information about courses and programs, and is available online and in hard format.

Student recruitment is performed by trained admissions and counseling staff who are employees of the District.

The College's accredited status is affirmed in the College catalog and in other official publications, and is stated accurately and fully.

The College is in compliance with ACCJC policies regarding institutional advertising, student recruitment, and representation of accredited status.

Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits

The College conforms to commonly accepted standards and practices for awarding credits and degrees with a minimum of 60 semester credit hours required for an associate degree. The educational programs offered are congruent with the College's mission and are based on recognized fields of study. The College has written policies and procedures for determining that the credit hours meet commonly accepted academic expectations. Board Policy 3200-Curriculum and Instruction Committee identifies that the College follows Section 55002(a) and 55060-55072 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. The procedures detailed in BP 3200 ensure that the C&I facilitates, coordinates and maintains quality control procedures that are consistently applied to all courses and programs. The C&I Committee's policies and practices for review and approval ensure an appropriate level of rigor and statements of relevant expected learning outcomes. Assessment results are addressed in the Annual Assessment Report and Program Review processes. A team review of a sample of official course outlines of record, a schedule of classes, the College catalog, and current academic calendar confirms that the College's formula for establishing credit hours and educational programs is compliant with ACCJC policies regarding clock-to-credit-hour conversion.

The College is in compliance with ACCJC policies regarding institutional degrees and credits.

Policy on Award of Credit

Board Policy 4060 awards credit for certificates, degrees and transfer upon successful completion of an approved course of study. Students seeking transfer to the University of California or the California State University (CSU) may also be certified according to Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or CSU General Education requirements. These policies are in alignment with Education Code 66746 and Title 5 Sections 55060-55064 and 55070-55072.

Course credit is awarded based on the ability of the students to achieve the outcomes in the class resulting in a passing grade. Board Policy 3200 indicates that Title 5, Section 55002.5 is followed for determination of units, hours and completion of coursework based upon the Course Outline of Record (COR). The C&I review of the CORs requires that SLOs are an integral component of each course.

The College is in compliance with ACCJC policies regarding award of credit.

Policy on Transfer of Credit

Board Policy 4050 requires appropriate evaluation of each student's academic performance as an integral part of the student's learning experience at Pasadena City College. In the

absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith or incompetency, the faculty instructor (tenured, nontenured, or adjunct) is the final authority on the assignment of grades. Procedures for grading; awarding of credit, including credit by examination; and appealing decisions are established by the Superintendent/President and required to be understandable, fair, and consistent with state laws and Title 5, Section 55750.

The College is in compliance with ACCJC policies regarding transfer of credit.

Policy on Direct Assessment of Learning

The awarding of credit through Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and International Baccalaureate (IB) is clearly documented on pages 52-62 of the College catalog. Board Policy 4117 requires that student high school work be credited where articulated and that credit through examination be given in accordance with Title 5, Section 55051.

The College is in compliance with ACCJC policies regarding direct assessment of learning.

Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard I.A – Mission

General Observations

The current version of the mission statement for Pasadena City College (PCC) was approved by the Board of Trustees on June 2, 2010 (Board Policy 0200). This was an update from the 2002 mission statement and included the additional wording "in a variety of instructional modalities" to reflect a growing on-line education emphasis and enrollment.

The mission statement describes the College's educational mission and student population with a focus on students from "communities within the District service area." The mission statement includes an emphasis on student learning.

Findings and Evidence

PCC's mission clearly defines its educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. (Standard I.A)

PCC has established student learning programs and services aligned with its student population which currently includes a majority of students from outside the service area. Data indicate that a significant percentage of online student enrollments come from students residing outside the service area. (Standard I.A.1)

Achievement targets were set in the Educational Master Plan (EMP) ("Project 90 Achievement Scorecard"), though data through 2013-14 indicates that very few of the targets have been met and the College's Self Evaluation Report provides no explanation or evidence of plans for their obtainment. Interviews with staff revealed that neither achievement targets nor institution set standards are widely communicated or discussed; however, plans are underway to include that discussion in future program review processes.

The PCC mission statement was approved by the governing board and published in the College catalog and online. (Standard I.A.2)

According to Board meeting notes and confirmed by one Board member in an interview, the mission statement is reviewed each year by the Board of Trustees at its Annual Planning Retreat. Meeting minutes indicate that institutional governance committees have also reviewed the Mission Statement on a periodic basis. (Standard I.A.3)

It was noted in the 2009 Evaluation Team report that "Although the mission statement is reviewed at the annual planning retreat, the self-study accurately identifies the need to develop a systematic review timeline."

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is considering a proposal to shorten the Educational Master Plan (EMP) timeframe from ten to five years, although it is unclear

whether the mission statement will be part of that process. Institutional planning documents do not outline a systematic timeline for institutional governance committee review of the mission statement.

The mission statement was included in Educational Master Plan discussions and included on the most recent EMP, and is used to guide planning and decision making process, such as program review. (Standard I.A.4)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard I.A.

The Board Goals for the College 2014- 2017 include a focus on serving students in the District, which is consistent with its mission statement. The goal to "Develop methods for ensuring that all in-district students are able to enroll in full-time units leading to degree, certificate or transfer curriculum completion" includes a target that "50 percent of all in-district students will be enrolled in fulltime units by 2017." Recent graduates from District high schools who enroll in PCC's Pathways programs are given a higher enrollment priority.

According to fall-to-fall enrollment comparisons, in-district resident enrollment has declined from 29.5 percent in fall 2010 to 26.8 percent in fall 2014. The recently adopted 2014 Accreditation Standards emphasize assessing institutional performance based on its mission: "The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission …" The College would benefit from a continued dialogue about its intended student population and how best to achieve its mission. Reviewing the EMP more frequently than every 10 years would assist this effort.

While PCC does review its mission statement periodically, it would benefit from outlining a clear institutional process for review as identified in an Actionable Improvement Plan. The process might be linked to the revision of the Educational Master Plan and would allow the College to systematically review its mission statement to ensure the College was best meeting student needs.

Recommendations

None

Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard I.B – Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College demonstrates a sincere and concerted effort to improve its institutional effectiveness processes, including planning, program review, and budget integration. The College obtained two commercial software packages to assist in managing assessment and evaluation data: eLumen for student learning outcome (SLO) data and Taskstream for program review and planning. In addition, units can choose to use Excel to manage SLO data.

The College has not yet completed one cycle of the new program review process, so it is unproven whether or not the new process is effective or sustainable. Pasadena City College lacks a formal process for systematically evaluating planning. The team learned that some standing committees were not meeting and/or following established procedures for documenting their work.
.

Findings and Evidence

The team notes that the College clearly describes how it conducts an ongoing dialogue about student learning. However, it does not describe improvements made as a result of the dialogue. The College does not discuss efforts to assess and improve institutional processes, or describe changes to institutional processes that may have been made. The team found several key areas where dialogue occurs, such as during program review, and professional learning activities with the Academy of Professional Learning. (Standard I.B.1)

Even though the College describes its Educational Master Plan, and highlights the Achievement Scorecard for Project 90 Achievement Areas, the team found that the College does not address the relationship between the Project 90 Achievement Areas and the Mission Critical Priorities. Although the College presents the Targets for the Project 90 Achievement Scorecard, it does not present measurable outcomes for the other Mission Critical Priorities or Mission Critical Strategies. (Standard I.B.2)

The College describes unit/program review goals and objectives, and the targets that are set at the unit level. Although measureable goals and targets are set at the unit level during the review phase of program review, it is not clear how unit planning is conducted, or how unit planning connects with the College budget and resource allocation.

The College has two more central master plans: technology and facilities. Neither plan contains measureable goals to permit assessment of progress in addressing the plan.

The College has made a concerted and commendable effort to conceptualize program review around pathways and student success. The College describes a new program review process

that was developed after 2009. The Self Evaluation Report states, "The program and unit review process is the primary mechanism used to assess the effectiveness of programs and service at PCC." However, the team could not find evidence that program review is part of the planning process, or integrated with budget allocations. (Standard I.B.3)

The new program review process began in 2010-11. It appears that one program review was conducted that year by Basic Skills. In 2011-12, CTE programs were scheduled to conduct program review. In 2012-13 and 2013-14, AA Majors completed program review and a calendar was created. In 2014-15, Student Services and Administrative Units are scheduled to complete program review. The number of units involved in each of these program review cycles is unclear, as is the percent that completed the scheduled program review. The report asserts that program review "leads to the identification of recommendations for improvement that feed into planning documents and resource requests." This process flows through the Broad Recommendations developed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) based on program reviews, and which then inform budgeting. Because this process is based on program reviews, participation in the program review process is critical to the success of linking planning and budgeting. There was insufficient evidence of the degree of participation in program review. Direct resource requests are not made through program review.

The College also developed, in response to a prior recommendation, an extensive and consistent set of quantitative and qualitative data for use in program review. The data are conveniently made available to reviewers in the Taskstream workspace. The data include student demographic and achievement outcomes information, presented in both tabular and graphical formats. In addition, qualitative data from eLumen and other sources are used. Extensive training and workshops were provided in 2013 and 2014 and are planned for 2015.

The College describes three master plans: Educational Master Plan (EMP), Facilities Master Plan and Technology Master Plan, as well as three Planning Levels: Area, Unit, and Department. Department Annual Plans are optional, while Unit Plans are scheduled every three years, and Area Plans are scheduled every five years. The Academic and Student Affairs 2012-2017 Area Plan is a more detailed expression of the Priorities and Strategies in the Educational Master Plan.

The College cites allocation of instructional equipment funds in 2014 and the Student Access and Success Initiative (SASI) as examples of using evaluation to fund requests to fulfill the College mission and EMP. The team determined that the College should make a stronger case by incorporating the allocation process into standing processes, such as program review, instead of creating a new, one-time process. The one-time process is not systematic, or amenable to evaluation itself. In addition, it creates additional work for applicants to complete specialized applications, rather than making the request in a systematic way through program review.

The team found evidence for much input from constituent groups into the new Educational Master Plan. The Technology Master Plan, still in draft form according to the evidence, had input from two committees and two surveys, and the Facilities Master Plan used input

provided by stakeholders through facilitated forums. None of the plans have measureable outcomes, so it is not possible for the College to evaluate its progress toward meeting the goals of the plans. The team did not find evidence of linkage between plans and budgetary expenditures. The program review process does not include a component linking it to area level or institutional planning, or a resource request component. The Area Plans, the two key plans at the vice president level, do not articulate goals which align with EMP goals. The team found insufficient evidence of the connection between the Area Plans and budget requests. (Standard I.B.4)

PCC provided evidence of strong data analysis and presentation, as well as information about the quality of its programs and student achievements, all available on its web site. (Standard I.B.5)

PCC conducted a survey of program review respondents in 2010, following the initial implementation of TaskStream. The results of the survey were discussed with Academic Senate, administration, and College Coordinating Council. Recommended changes to the software and program review questions were implemented. A campus climate survey, which included planning questions, was administered in fall 2010; however, analysis of the meaning and implications of the data was not presented. PCC engaged in an Integrated Planning Session designed to evaluate the program review, planning and budgeting processes. Notes were written, documenting the recommendations resulting from the discussion. The group met again in the fall of 2013 and reviewed a draft revised integrated planning model. The team did not find a description of a systematic approach to evaluation of the program review and planning processes that would be continued in a regular, on-going way. (Standard I.B.6)

The program review process and the SLO Annual Assessment Report provide the vehicles to evaluate effectiveness in both areas. Both areas receive ongoing institutional support through standing committees, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Learning Assessment Committee, as well as technical support through the TaskStream software and the eLumen software. (Standard I.B.7)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard I.B, except I.B.3, 4, 6 and 7.

A complete cycle of the newly-defined program review process has not yet occurred. While SLO assessment is integrated into program review, the program review process does not include planning or budget integration. Program review is optional at the department level; however, program reviews are required for all programs and faculty members do participate at the unit level to examine the results of SLO assessment.

The College is currently evaluating the effectiveness of its program review and planning processes; however, the team could not find any indication that the evaluation is part of a regular, on-going, systematic approach to process evaluation.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1
In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendations #1 and #2 (2009), the team recommends that the College systematically evaluate and improve all of its planning processes, including full integration of program review (instructional, student services, and administrative services) into the planning processes, and the use of program review and the planning processes to determine the allocation of resources and to make decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.6; I.B.7; II.A.2.e and f; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.4 and Eligibility Requirement 19)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard II.A – Instructional Programs

General Observations

Pasadena City College offers a variety of courses and programs, both credit and non-credit, at the main campus, the Rosemead Center, the Community Education Center and the Child Development Center. These courses are delivered through many modalities and culminate in degrees, certificates and employment. There are processes with timelines in place for instructional programs to undergo a rigorous curriculum review, program review and student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment addressing one SLO each semester. There is evidence of collection and analysis of course and program SLO assessment data for some, but not all, of the programs. There has been a lot of work on the assessment process at PCC. Student learning outcomes have been identified in all courses and programs. 62.4 percent of courses are assessed, and 100 percent of programs and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)/ General Education Learning Outcomes (GEOs) are assessed. There have been issues with the assessment software, the assessments and the reporting, but these issues have been identified and are being addressed.

Findings and Evidence

Pasadena City College demonstrates that instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity as evidenced in its mission statement. (Standard II.A.1) However, the current emphasis on General Education course expansion through online course availability (EMP Mission Critical Strategy A2.2) and the Rosemead Center, coupled with the increasingly large percentage of students that live outside the physical service area, should be considered when the mission is reviewed again. (Standard II.A.1.a)

PCC courses and programs are offered in a variety of instructional modalities which reflect academic excellence delivered in a student learning environment that is technologically, intellectually and culturally stimulating. Student engagement is emphasized and students are encouraged to be responsible for their own academic success through many pathways and optional learning support opportunities. Excellent hands-on instruction through the Child Development Center lab, integrated music and art programs, as well as redesigned technology pathways through the California Career Pathways Trust (CCPT) grants, indicate a commitment to relevant future student needs. PCC ensures quality and improvement of instructional programs through a rigorous Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Committee review process. (Standard II.A.1.b)

Courses are developed by faculty who are guided through the work by advisory boards where applicable. (Standards II.A.1.b and II.A.5) Observations of the C&I meeting procedures revealed active renovation of courses and programs, updating of content, and pathways linked to employment, transfer and other pathway needs. (Standards II.A.2, 3, 4 and 5) Further evidence of current and relevant learning opportunities improved through program

and curriculum review, community input, advisory board interaction and work with transfer institutions include (Standards II.A.1.a-e):

- Newly designed noncredit offerings at the CEC through the AB 86 collaborations
- The Pasadena Child Development Workforce Initiative Program
- First Year Pathways
- ESL curriculum redesign
- Online Model course offerings
- Design Tech pathways
- 113 CID approved courses
- 435 Associate Degrees for Transfer awarded (AS-T and AA-T) for 2013-14

SLOs are included on Course Outlines of Record and the C&I Committee reviews SLOs as part of its approval process. According to the 2013-14 Annual Accreditation report, only 62 percent of courses had an ongoing assessment. (Standard II.A.2.a) Program outcomes assessment results are included in program reviews. Outcomes receive an overview through a rigorous process. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) has developed a rubric to review and evaluate data and provides detailed feedback for each program review. Program review feedback is posted to the web, but it is up to the individual departments and authors to share the information and to take action based on the recommendations.   While the program review processes have been used to improve courses and programs, its use is not systematic (Standards II.A.2.a, b and c).

The Self Evaluation Report indicates that not all programs have submitted program reviews. Of those submitted, 80 percent have gone to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for analysis, review and feedback. Instructional programs are being reviewed on six-year cycles and the committee is working to review and adapt the evaluation and planning processes to include annual updates, but there are gaps. Completed program review for basic skills programs was only 75 percent, CTE certificates 86 percent, and degree programs 68 percent. There are issues with meeting deadlines and linking this work to budget allocation. Transparent and consistent linkage between curriculum reviews, program review, SLO outcomes assessment, planning and resource allocation need to be documented and communicated. (Standard II.A.2.e and f)

Evidence of some instructional program reviews was readily provided during the visit, displaying common data sets and rigorous analysis, but the linkage to planning and budget allocation was unclear. Instructional requests for ad hoc funds are well designed and incorporate SLO evidence as displayed in the justification. But the ongoing linkage of program review and SLO assessment to resource allocations beyond ad hoc funding needs to be clarified and made transparent. (Standards II.A.2.e and f)

Courses and programs are also improved through analysis and closing the loop with SLO assessment. (Standards II.A.2.a, b and c) It should be noted that the process has been hampered by technical problems and is not completed by all faculty, particularly adjuncts. Training and expanded participation must be addressed. The College uses two commercial software packages to assist in managing assessment and evaluation data: eLumen for SLO data and Taskstream for program and GEO outcomes, as well as program review and

planning. In addition, some faculty choose to manage, submit and store assessment data in Excel, while others use eLumen. These practices cater to individual faculty preferences but make tracking and communicating the data institutionally more difficult. (Standard II.A.2.f) The SLO course data are aggregated up to program and General Education Outcomes (GEO) level in Taskstream through alignment built into eLumin. The aggregation of data is carried out by faculty leads in the programs. (Standards II.A.2.a, b, e, g and h)

The team examined evidence showing that SLO assessment work included dialog and resulted in improvement in a variety of credit and non-credit programs, such as High School Diploma, Fashion, English, Accounting Clerk, Anesthesia and Anthropology. The team reviewed the rigorous feedback for various programs, including Accounting Clerk, Anesthesia, ESL, and Geography. SLO assessment is an integral part of instructional program review and contributes to unit planning. The connection between outcomes assessment results and resource allocation is more difficult to identify, but was evident in some specific fund allocations, such as the Instructional Equipment allocation process for Chemistry. (Standard II.A.2.c, e and f) The team determined that PCC has not yet fully resolved the deficiencies identified in 2009 Recommendation #2 which states, in part, "…. The team further recommends that the student learning outcomes assessment be incorporated into the program review, program planning, and resource allocation processes."

Further efforts to expand to all courses and programs, including on-time submission and robust SLO outcomes dialog, appears to be occurring. The 2014 ACCJC Annual Report indicates that 100 percent of programs, 100 percent of GEOs/ILOs and 100 percent of GE courses have on-going SLO assessment; however, only 62 percent of college courses have on-going assessment. Careful documentation of data and tracking of outcomes will be essential in the future (Standards II.A.2. a-i) Incorporation of instructional program data from online courses and coursework at the Rosemead Center will need to be integrated with the larger College efforts in order to face the entire picture of student needs at PCC. (Standards II.A.2.d and f)

After observation of the evidence from the C&I and the Learning Assessment Committee (LAC), it is clear that delivery modes and teaching methodologies are carefully evaluated. This information is then translated into feedback from the committees in oral and written reports that result in professional development to expand and ensure quality delivery modes and teaching methodologies. (Standard II.A.2.d) Professional development, a Mission Critical Priority, is carefully planned providing faculty with numerous opportunities to update and improve curriculum. The Academy of Professional Learning (APL) is a faculty project that developed a professional development program at PCC with the mission "to foster institutional excellence through inquiry based practice and collaborative learning opportunities. By engaging faculty, staff, and managers in organizational, instructional, and personal development, we promote collegiality and student achievement." (Standard II.A.2.d)

On-going efforts to develop a quality Distance Education program through procedures, training, model course development, evaluation and improvement was in evidence. Interviews, review of evidence and observation of online courses revealed strong distance education offerings and an innovative and quality-based plan. These DE changes meet the

ACCJC DE policies and eligibility requirements, in addition to fully responding to the previous accreditation recommendation concerning DE (2009 Recommendation #3). PCC has produced a model for other colleges to consider with regards to training, certification and course delivery. (Standards II.A.1.b and II.A.2.c)

PCC has recently changed its learning management system (LMS) to Canvas and created a variety of training opportunities for enhanced, online and hybrid coursework for current and future needs of students. (Standard II.A.1.b) Faculty hiring is based upon expertise, and appropriate advisory committees appear to be in place where needed. The LAC and IEC make recommendations for improvement based upon student achievement, learning outcomes assessment and program review. Interviews with and observation of the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Committee revealed strong process, procedures, thorough review, and closing the loop for improvement. Following its procedures, the C&I Committee only approves courses and programs with SLOs and assessment plans. Materials directing the curriculum flow, approval process, creation, modification and deletion of curriculum were examined and found to be clear and complete relying on faculty expertise and characterized by faculty and administrative cooperative work. (Standards II.A.1.c, e and f) Examination of the catalog, schedule and syllabi provided clear and accurate information (Standard II.A.6) and unit hours and credits comply with standard higher education expectations. (Standard II.A.2.h) In addition, numerous interviews with faculty and deans, supplemented by classroom observations of online and face-to-face courses, verified the high quality of instruction, appropriate sequencing, length, depth and rigor. (Standard II.A.2.c)

The College demonstrates a conscious effort to design, deliver and assess Distance Learning courses. The College sets outcomes-based measurable goals, makes efforts to analyze progress and to provide evidence of the achievements in their DE program and its aim to support student learning. The Commission accepted the College's Substantive Change Proposal to offer at least 50 percent of course units for programs taught through Distance Education. The College designed and implemented the Online Model Course Program to guide and support the development of fully online and hybrid GE Pathway courses, and to therefore expand the availability of transfer and CTE courses. PCC also developed and implemented a semester-long program to train instructors and ensure the quality and integrity of delivering online courses. The College's approved Distance Education Policy and DE Faculty Handbook are available on the PCC website.

Student learning outcomes have been identified and, although not assessed in 100 percent of courses and programs, are in the process of being assessed, with dialogue and improvement characteristic in many areas. SLOs are assessed on an annual basis within a multi-year cycle of evaluation. These assessments are aggregated into an assessment report that is reviewed by the LAC where extensive feedback is provided to SLO authors who are asked to share the information with others in the department.

The assessment report is included as part of the instructional program reviews, which are due every six years for most programs and two years for CTE programs. The length of the program review cycle does not allow for an effective linkage to the annual resource allocation process. While steps are being taken to close this loop, it is not yet in place. There

are examples where achievement and outcomes data is included as part of resource allocation decision making (such as faculty position prioritization, and instructional equipment allocations); however, the process is not yet systematic. (Standard II.A.2.f)

PCC administers the Accuplacer Exams in Math, English and ESL and validates their effectiveness to measure student learning and minimize biases. The cut-scores are determined and checked by departmental faculty. CASAS testing is used in the non-credit ESL program as required by funding sources. Multiple Measures are in place, and faculty members are working on research that examines the effectiveness of the current process. (Standard II.A.2.g)

The College awards credit based upon the achievement of learning outcomes. PCC aligns its requirements with course identification (C-ID) and Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) requirements, in addition to Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and California State University Breadth (CSUB) requirements to guarantee that curriculum adopted is consistent with the norms of higher education. (Standards II.A.2.h and i)

Academic and vocational programs include general education (GE) curriculum based upon a carefully considered philosophy. A GE student learning outcomes matrix maps the GE outcomes to courses and programs. (Standard II.A.3) The general education pathways are clearly stated in the PCC catalog on pages 17, 72, 74, and 105-108. The explanation for GE course credit through Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and International Baccalaureate (IB) is clearly documented on pages 52-62 of the catalog. There are several GE patterns clearly defined that connect students with the appropriate coursework. (Standards II.A.3.a-c) The institution relies on the expertise of its faculty to determine the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the GE program by using a matrix to examine the stated learning outcomes for the course. All instructional departments are asked to align their course level SLOs with the College GE outcomes to facilitate aggregation of SLO data to the GE outcomes level. The team could not find evidence that the matrix has been completed for all courses.

There are five general education outcomes (GEOs): Communication, Cognition, Information Competency, Social Responsibility, and Personal Development which cover the methodology and content areas required by the standards. (Standards II.A.3.a, b, and c) GEOs are assessed by aggregating course-level data and by direct assessment of student work. GEO data are found in annual assessment reports, eLumen GEO data and the course SLO alignment matrix. The LAC is responsible for reviewing GEO assessments and, although student performance scores were reported, the analysis and meaning of these data were not discussed. Well over 93 percent of all students achieved standard or exemplary performance in GEOs per eLumen data, which would seem to indicate needed analysis of the assessment techniques or the GEOs themselves.

As evidenced in the catalog, online and printed material, as well as the online curriculum documents, all PCC degree programs are focused on at least one area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core. (Standard II.A.4) Students that complete vocational and occupational certificates meet applicable standards as evidenced by examination and licensure, and labor

force research is required by C&I for all CTE programs. Data regarding licensure rates are publicly reported and easily accessible. (Standard II.A.5)

Examination of online, catalog, schedule and other published materials indicate that 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. The team sampled a variety of class sections (online, adjunct, full-time, onsite and at centers) and determined that students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline of record. (Standards II.A.6.a-c)

PCC Board Policy 3210 and the accompanying procedures outline the process for discontinuing a program, which includes input from the College C&I Committee. The College has de-activated several certificate programs over the last several years, including Makeup Technology in summer 2014 and a noncredit copying program. The team observed the deactivation of courses and discontinuation process during a C&I meeting. (Standard II.A.6.b)

PCC regularly updates its catalog, schedule and Board Policies. A review of online materials indicates that Board Policy revisions are posted under a new numbering system on the College website. The College catalog is available online as well as a searchable course list. (Standard II.A.6.c) Governing board policies about academic honesty/student conduct (Board Policy 4520) and academic freedom (Board Policy 3100) are found on page 69 of the catalog. (Standards II.A.7.a-c) Although study abroad is offered for current PCC students in short-term and long-term programs, there are no foreign-based programs offered to students other than U.S. students. (Standard II.A.8)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard II.A, except II.A.2.e and f.

Student learning outcomes assessment is incorporated into the program review process; however, program reviews are not consistently completed for all programs, and program reviews are not fully integrated into the institutional planning and resource allocation processes.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #1.

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard II.B – Student Support Services

General Observations

Pasadena City College (PCC) supports the learning and success of its students by offering an array of student services that are delivered through various methods on campus and online, in addition to a selective range of services at its offsite centers in Rosemead and the Community Education Center (CEC).   At all locations, student support services are staffed with dedicated personnel who serve a large population of student enrollment.

The College has excellent support services with documented evidence that enhances student success on a number of "student sponsored" programs. The Veterans Program, Health Center, Safe Zone Coalition and Psychological Services are examples of exemplary programs with data assessing student satisfaction which contribute to the mission of the College. The College provides excellent demographic data in their publication "Observations" for all categorical programs with respect to success, retention, certificate/degree and transfer achievements; however, specific student learning outcome data was not readily available.

Findings and Evidence

The College offers all the traditional student support services programs: EOPS, CARE, CalWORKs, DSP&S, Career, Ujima, Puente, counseling, and additional "student sponsored" programs including Veterans Services, Psychology Services and Health Services. These have been arranged into five student learning service programs: Enrollment Services, Student Support Services (SSS), Learning Assistance, Engagement and Exiting the College, which are based on student progress through their educational career.   The Self Evaluation Report provided information relating to the quality of some, but not all, of these services. Through meetings with department representatives, the team found documented evidence of quality throughout student services programs. (Standard II.B.1)

The Pasadena City College catalog was redesigned in 2009 by counseling faculty and staff. It presents information in a logical, easy-to-use format. It contains all necessary material, including general information, requirements, and major policies affecting students. The catalog is updated every fall semester, providing current information about courses and programs. This may not be timely for interactions that take place between counselors and new students prior to the start of the fall semester. (Standard II.B.2)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) conducts research that is analyzed to determine student learning needs. For example, it provided data that distance education students' success and retention rates were lower than those of students in face-to-face classes. In response, the College implemented "SmartThinking," a 24-hour online tutoring service. Student Success Scorecard data revealed low completion rates in math for students who start below the transfer level. This led to the development of PAWS, a pre-assessment workshop to help students improve their math placement, and the implementation of ALEKS, an adaptive learning computer program. There are over 70 computer labs available for students,

many of which have tutoring services available through instructional (STACC, Math Path) and student services areas (Pathways, PAWS). Individual departments also conduct evaluations of students learning needs through student surveys. (Standard II.B.3)

PCC provides a comprehensive array of services to its students. Students at Rosemead and CEC have access to a number of on-site services including admissions, counseling, registration, financial aid, and tutoring. Students at both centers have access to additional services via phone and email. They also have access to counseling and orientation online. The College has made a concerted effort to increase access to counselors during peak times by providing walk-in counselors at various high-traffic areas on campus and by modifying their appointment scheduling process. Students utilize LancerPoint to access their records and Canvas for their online classes. (Standard II.B.3.a)

Through its numerous clubs and ongoing activities, PCC offers students opportunities for intellectual, aesthetic and personal development. The Associated Students of PCC provide a way for students to gain leadership experience and practice civic responsibility. PCC incorporates civic responsibility and personal development into its General Education Outcomes and personal development is also a component of First Year Pathways and the counseling curriculum. (Standard II.B.3.b)

The institution designs and maintains counseling programs to support student development. Counselors assist with the design of educational plans and issues related to a student's success. Recently, the department changed its appointment process to improve access for students. It has also redesigned its new student group orientations to better serve students. A large percentage of the counseling staff are adjuncts and the department also employs paraprofessionals who work as advisors or coaches in the Pathways Program. To ensure counselors are prepared for their duties, all new full-time counselors go through a three-unit one-year orientation process for new faculty. Both full-time and adjunct counselors receive additional training through department meetings, a two-month shadowing process, and professional development opportunities. The department has also created a training handbook for new counselors. The counseling department surveys all students who access appointments to evaluate their services and learning outcomes. (Standard II.B.3.c)

PCC's commitment to diversity is reflected in its mission, its core values and its GEO outcomes. It is also apparent in the fact that the College supports the Cross-Cultural Center, which sponsors activities and workshops related to issues of diversity and social justice. The Cultural Diversity Initiative has been responsible for creating a diversity-related lecture series, campus-wide discussions about diversity and an African American History Month celebration. Clubs host diversity-related activities such as the "Big Gay Prom." There are also learning communities such as Puente and Ujima that focus on Latino and African-American culture and history. The PCC Superintendent/President maintains advisory committees related to Asian Pacific Islanders, African Americans, Armenian Americans, and Latinos. Another example of the College's commitment to diversity is reflected in the fact that students must complete an "Ethnic and Gender Studies" or "Global Studies" course in order to complete a degree. (Standard II.B.3.d)

The College conducts consequential validation studies of assessment instruments every six years to determine appropriate placement, with a 75 percent threshold of satisfaction. Findings indicated that the cut scores for ESL and some math classes required adjustment of +5 points. This change was implemented in 2010. Evidence of cut score validation for these changes was found to be in compliance with the Chancellor's Office standard. The Assessment Department reviews its student learning outcomes through surveys to students, and regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its testing instrument. (Standard II.B.3.e)

Board policies address the storage, retention and release of student records. Records are variously maintained behind firewalls in the student information system, on microfilm/microfiche, through a scanning and imaging system and in a vault in the basement of the Student Services Building. Information Technology Services (ITS) is responsible for the security of online records. The Admissions and Records Office provides information about the release of records through FERPA excerpts. (Standard II.B.3.f)

The College's Self Evaluation Report lacked adequate detail for Standard II.B.4. The report identified program reviews as the primary means by which quality of services is assured. Learning outcomes assessment is part of program review, and although the team saw evidence that such assessments have occurred, it did not see evidence that all departments conduct assessments annually, as stated in the report. Within Student Affairs there is confusion regarding the frequency of program reviews. Depending upon the source of the information, program reviews were documented as occurring every 3, 4, 5 or 6 years. The team received evidence that many, but not all, departments had conducted a program review since 2008.

In 2013, Student Affairs created five student learning service "programs" which also correspond to five Student Affairs learning outcomes. These programs were scheduled to undergo review in 2014, but the team was not provided evidence that all the reviews had been completed. College staff described to the team their difficulties in determining how to assess the outcomes for these five programs. Activities are underway at the College to improve this process and to assure outcomes are assessed for all five Student Affairs service programs. (Standard II.B.4)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard II.B. A recommendation to improve institutional effectiveness is stated below.

Recommendations

Recommendation #9
In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that all Student Affairs departments and service programs conduct annual outcomes assessments, and that a regular program review cycle be clearly established and communicated to all student service programs. (Standard II.B.4)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard II.C – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

PCC's library and learning support services provide an abundant array of comprehensive, quality resources and services to students. PCC has seventeen learning support service centers on the campus, at the Community Education Center (CEC), and at the Rosemead Center. On-campus learning support services are available as early as 7:00 a.m. and as late as 10:00 p.m. The library provides wireless internet, electronic databases, library orientation, and research assistance that are available 24/7 through live chat online assistance. SmarThinking online tutoring services are available to assist students 24/7 online.

The Library Technology Program has awarded 14-28 certificates for the last six years and the program has resulted in 100 percent job placement. Tutoring is available campus-wide and is associated with a variety of disciplines and special projects. The Self Evaluation Report evidence and extensive on-site research indicate that the library supports many programs and provides opportunities for instructors to bring students for library orientation and research experience tailored to the discipline and assignment needs of each individual instructor. The library provides exceptional support in their textbook open stack service. The library and other learning support services provide quality support of instructional programs that are aligned with PCC's mission, and are accessible regardless of location or means of delivery. (Standard II.C.1)

Findings and Evidence

The institution supports its instructional programs by providing many diverse services regardless of the location (CEC and Rosemead Center) or means of delivery (online, face-to-face, hybrid or web-enhanced). (Standard II.C.1) The library and learning support services provided evidence through written materials, data, tours, on-sight interviews and interviews with students that educational equipment, materials and programs provided by the library and learning support services enhance the quality of education at PCC. (Standard II.C.1.a)

The library provides a variety of computer workstations, laptops than can be checked out, and study areas labeled as noisy, quiet and group study rooms. Librarians provide information competency instruction to students in a variety of ways. PCC library provides one-on-one instruction related to research at the reference desk and online through Question Point. Library faculty members teach information competency skills as a component of the First-Year Experience course and they develop information literacy tutorials and offer information competency workshops for students; they also teach a College Research class. For the past five years, more than 11,000 students per year have attended information competency sessions. The most recent student survey data indicates that more than 85 percent of students believe their research skills have improved as a result of their educational experience. (Standard II.C.1.b)

PCC has many learning resource centers, including the ESL Center, the Foreign Language Lab, the Learning Assistance Center (LAC), the Writing Center, as well as tutoring and supplemental instruction in Math, Speech Communication, Natural Sciences, Engineering, Social Sciences and Career Technical areas. The LAC has a nationally recognized tutor training program, and data indicate strong use and satisfaction with tutoring services.

The library provides wireless internet, electronic databases, library orientation, and research assistance available 24/7 through live chat online assistance. SmarThinking tutoring is available 24/7 online to assist all students regardless of location or modality being used. (Standard II.C.1.c)

PCC maintains and secures the library and other learning support services. Information Technology Services provide the maintenance for computers in the library and in other learning support areas; the College has established a five-year refresh cycle for upgrading computers. Library and other learning support services staff are responsible for the security of their equipment. The library has security gates, and computers and scanners have been bolted to desks to prevent theft. The maintenance of library facilities is part of the planning process. The Self Evaluation Report indicates that there is a need for infrastructure improvements, noting that furniture is more than 20 years old and some library materials recently sustained maintenance-related water damage. (Standard II.C.1.d)

When collaborating with other library sources, formal agreements are documented. (Standard II.C.1.e)

PCC regularly evaluates the adequacy of the collections and resources for student needs. This is demonstrated in the changes seen in the library stacks, open stacks textbook services, check-out laptops and numerous other changes made in library practices as a result of assessment and student feedback. Survey data was reported showing favorable student and faculty feedback. Interviews indicated tangible responsiveness to faculty coursework and needs. The learning centers are often evaluated within the discipline or program where they reside. Although user data was often reported, it would be helpful to have additional useful outcomes data for the learning support areas to further direct student success. Stronger evidence of library, LAC and other learning support area data that link to GEOs, and disaggregated student success data should be developed to provide stronger program planning in the future. (Standard II.C.2)

Conclusion

The College meets Standard II.C.

The library and learning resources enhance and extend the learning of PCC students. The library, LAC and other learning support services intend to better assess student need through program review, planning and budgeting in order to improve institutional effectiveness.

Recommendations

None

Standard III - Resources
Standard III.A - Human Resources

General Observations

It is evident that Pasadena City College (PCC) is staffed by professionals at every level and in every job classification who care deeply about their students and their College. There is a clear sense of pride among PCC staff, faculty, managers, and administrators in the rich history of their College, in their innovative and effective programs, and in the successes of their students.

However, since its last accreditation self-study in 2009, Pasadena City College has come through a period of administrative turnover and turmoil, including at the Superintendent/ Presidential level, and has experienced governance challenges that, in many cases, led to serious internal issues regarding trust and collegiality, as well as to the degradation of campus relations. These issues of climate and trust have impacted aspects of the College's human resources functions relative to faculty hiring priorities, personnel evaluation processes, and professional development endeavors. Additionally, the College's current administrative structure is marked by a large number of positions filled on an interim basis, with some of those interim appointments extending for overly long periods of time.

Findings and Evidence

The College assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support its programs and services. Evidence indicates that there are clear processes to ensure that candidates for employment are thoroughly screened and evaluated through the recruitment and hiring process. (Standard III.A.1)

The College has established hiring policies and processes in place to hire qualified personnel. These policies include guidelines for the development of detailed job descriptions, hiring processes that include demonstrated sensitivity to and understanding of diversity issues, and processes that are inclusive of constituency groups. Job descriptions are written to address institution mission and goals, as well as accurately reflect the duties, responsibilities, and authority of the positions. Criteria for selection of faculty include subject matter or service area knowledge, and College faculty play a significant role in the selection of new faculty. There is an established procedure for ensuring that faculty and administrative hires meet the minimum qualifications for faculty and administrators as determined by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

While hiring policies for part-time faculty, full-time faculty, and administrators have been recently updated (2012), the hiring policy for classified staff was last updated in 2003 and is long overdue for review. The Human Resources (HR) Department is currently in the process of forming committees to review and update each of the four hiring policies. Additionally, while there are clear procedures delineated in the hiring policies for full-time faculty (e.g., the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee), there have been concerns expressed about

deviations from the established processes that led to dissention and discord between the Faculty Senate and the administration during the 2013 hiring prioritization process. This deviation from established policy appears to have been corrected during the most recent prioritization process and PCC is currently in the process of hiring 36 new faculty members. (Standard III.A.1.a)

Evaluation practices and processes have been established for all constituency groups with identified intervals for regular evaluations. Evaluation materials for most employees are included in the employees' personnel files that are maintained securely in the HR department. Some faculty evaluation materials, however, were until recently kept in the office of the Academic and Student Affairs Assistant Superintendent/Sr. Vice President's Office. At the request of the Executive Director of Human Resources, these evaluation documents were physically relocated to the Human Resources Office in the fall of 2014. The documents themselves, however, have yet to be filed in the appropriate personnel files and remain in boxes in the HR Department. An examination of randomly selected personnel files showed evidence that employee evaluations are not being conducted in accordance with the identified regular schedules established by the College or required under Title 5. A random sample of 12 personnel files representing administrative, faculty, classified and adjunct faculty employees showed that 75 percent of those files were missing evidence to document that the regularly required evaluations had taken place. In two cases, there were no documented evaluations at all, including for an employee who had been hired by the College in 2008. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Full-time faculty have a component in their evaluations regarding the incorporation and assessment of student learning outcomes. However, adjunct faculty members may be evaluated using one of three possible formats (Faculty Review of Professional Performance, Review of Professional Qualities and Contributions, or Student Evaluations), only one of which (Faculty Review of Professional Performance) includes language relative to student learning outcomes. Therefore, it is entirely possible that adjunct faculty members would be evaluated without any consideration of assessment of stated learning outcomes. Similarly, the evaluation documents for classified staff and management staff do not include specific references to assessment of student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

In response to a recommendation resulting from the College's 2009 comprehensive accreditation process (Recommendation #4), PCC has written codes of ethics for management and classified staff that identify standards of behavior. The Board of Trustees approved these policies in September 2010. While the College has met the requirements of the 2009 recommendation and now has approved codes of ethics for management and classified staff as well as administrators, members of the governing board, and faculty, there is no evidence to support that the college policies relative to codes of ethics are widely followed. Following are excerpts from the approved policies:
- AP 3070-Professional Ethics of Classified Staff demands that classified staff engage in "fair and respectful interactions with colleagues" and treat others with "respect."
- AP 3050-Professional Ethics of Faculty demands that faculty "show due respect to their faculty colleagues" and "professionally criticize" those with whom they don't agree."

- AP 3060-Professional Ethics of Management demands that managers work to "develop a climate of trust," "foster openness by encouraging communication," and "challenge unethical behavior."
- BP 2715-Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice demands that members of the Board of Trustees demonstrate "respect and consideration for each other, college staff, and community members" and make attempts to "re-establish collegial communications in the event that violations of norms are perceived to have occurred."

There is ample evidence to suggest that these policies are widely disregarded and are not enforced. The climate of distrust, the erosion of participatory governance, and the lack of respect recounted in the Self Evaluation Report and confirmed by a variety of on-campus interviews with employees of all job classifications support that these policies are not being followed and that there are no apparent ramifications for those individuals who violate the codes of ethics. (Standards III.A.1.d, III.A.3 and III.A.4.c)

The College maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty members to support its programs and mission. PCC exceeded its Faculty Obligation Number (FON) per Title 5 regulations by 33 full-time positions in 2013, and the College is currently actively seeking to fill 36 new faculty positions. While the College reports that the equivalent of 33 full-time faculty equivalents (FTFE) are currently reassigned from their instructional duties, the College still meets its FON as reported by the Chancellor's Office. The institution has a number of administrative positions that are either vacant or that are filled by personnel in an interim/acting capacity. Some of these interim appointments extend beyond the College's own administrative procedure (AP 7250), which limits interim appointments to 18-months and, in some cases, extend beyond what is permissible under Title 5 regulations. While there may be a sufficient number of staff and administrators necessary to provide the administrative services required to support the institution's mission, there is evidence that the College's practice of engaging in multiple reorganizations over the last 3-4 years, of making interim appointments that extend beyond the permitted time frame, and of moving personnel from one interim position to another has had deleterious effects on employee evaluation practices and has led to confusion of roles, structures, and responsibilities institution-wide. (Standard III.A.2)

The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review through the College website and the College equitably and consistently administers these policies. Additionally, the College updates and maintains policies and practices consistent with California Education Code. The College has a comprehensive Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan with a robust meeting schedule. Additionally, the EEO Plan presents excellent data on employment equity and diversity and includes a plan to address areas of under-representation. (Standard III.A.3)

There is evidence to support that the College has written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures as indicated in various board policies and administrative procedures as they relate to hiring practices. (Standard III.A.3.a)

Personnel records are securely maintained in locked file cabinets that are located in the HR Office separate from the reception area. Personnel files are available for review by the

employee or by appropriate administrative or supervisory personnel by appointment during normal business hours. (Standard III.A.3.b)

PCC demonstrates an understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity as evidenced by its mission statement (Board Policy 1200), in its stated core values, in its EEO plan, and in each of its Administrative Procedures regarding employee codes of ethics. (Standards III.A.4 and III.A.4.a, b)

While the College offers all personnel the opportunity for varying degrees of professional development, much of this appears to happen in silos and is not afforded to all employee classifications equitably. This is supported by the 2013 Academy of Professional Learning survey of professional learning needs which found that nearly 75 percent of classified staff indicated that there were insufficient professional learning opportunities afforded to them to support their professional growth. This was corroborated by on-campus interviews with classified staff members in both leadership and non-leadership positions. The College has recently begun to move AP 6030-Professional Development through the shared governance process, but the policy has not been approved and is not yet being implemented. There is not sufficient evidence to support that the College has a comprehensive, systematic, equitable, well-coordinated and thoroughly assessed professional development program. (Standard III.A.5.a, b)

The College has developed program and unit reviews that help to identify human resources needs within those programs and units. This information then flows into the College's Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) process. Additionally, staff members in the Human Resources Department have engaged in meaningful program review of their area that included the development of an HR-specific mission statement and associated outcomes. While progress has been made in integrating Human Resources planning into broader institutional planning, the College needs to continue to work toward full integration and assessment of all of their planning processes. (Standard III.A.6)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard III.A, except III.A.1.b, c and d, III.A.2, III.A.3, III.A.4.c, III.A.5.a and b, and III.A.6.

The College should ensure that personnel evaluations are taking place on a regular schedule in compliance with its policies and that those evaluations include references to the assessment of student learning outcomes for those who are directly responsible for working with students. Additionally, the College needs to follow its policies relative to professional and ethical behavior. Finally, the College should continue to work to improve their professional development program in order to meet the identified needs of faculty, staff, and management employees.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #1

Recommendation #2

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College create and implement a plan to ensure the regular evaluation of all employees based upon intervals consistent with College policies. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Recommendation #3

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College standardize its performance evaluation process for adjunct faculty, and that the College include assessment of student learning outcomes in its performance evaluations of adjunct faculty, staff, and management employees who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Recommendation #4

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College constituents follow their approved codes of ethics and that all constituent groups embrace and demonstrate compliance with Board Policy 2715-Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, AP 3050-Professional Ethics of Faculty, AP 3060-Professional Ethics of Management, and AP 3070-Professional Ethics of Classified Staff. (Standards III.A.1.d; III.A.3; III.A.4.c; IV.A and IV.B.1.e and h)

Recommendation #5

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College focus on stabilizing its administrative organizational structure and complete the selection processes to fill the interim, acting and vacant administrative positions with permanent appointments. (Standard III.A.2; Eligibility Requirement 5)

Recommendation #6

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College, through participatory governance, develop and implement a comprehensive, coordinated professional development program for all personnel, regularly assess the effectiveness of the program, and use the assessment results as the basis for continuous improvement. (Standards III.A.5.a and b)

Standard III - Resources
Standard III.B - Physical Resources

General Observations

Pasadena City College (PCC) offers programs and services at four locations: the Pasadena City College Main Campus located at 1500 East Colorado Boulevard, the Community Education Center (CEC) located at 3035 East Foothills Boulevard, the Child Development Center located at 1324 East Green Street, and the Rosemead Center located at 4105 North Rosemead, in Rosemead California. The Main Campus has 16 main buildings, two parking structures, and seven smaller buildings. The CEC is located about two miles away from the Main Campus in a two story facility housing both noncredit and credit programs. The Child Development Center is located two blocks away from the Main Campus in a two story facility. The College has been offering classes at the Rosemead Center since fall 2013. The Rosemead Center site was made available through a lease agreement with the El Monte Union High School District.

The team visited all four locations, and found that all locations appear safe and well maintained. The College developed a Facilities Master Plan in 2010 and an Educational Master Plan in 2011. Work is currently underway to update the Facilities Master Plan or "Centennial Facilities Master Plan." Measure P was approved by voters in 2002. Progress on building renovations and new construction through Measure P include a new Campus Center; Industrial Technologies Building; PCC Center for the Arts; elevator upgrades for Buildings C, E, and R; a five-level parking structure; restroom upgrades; and Building B classroom upgrades and expansion.

Findings and Evidence

The College ensures the safety of its facilities by utilizing safety inspections every two years with subsequent follow-ups. Safety inspections are performed by an outside contractor. Responsibility for facilities planning and scheduled maintenance planning rests with the Executive Director, Facilities and Construction.

The College developed a Facilities Master Plan in 2010 and an Educational Master Plan in 2011. Work is currently underway to update the Facilities Master Plan or "Centennial Facilities Master Plan." It was indicated to the team that an external firm will soon be selected to prepare this updated Facilities Master Plan.

The Main Campus has excellent classrooms and laboratories that assure the quality of programs and services. Visits to the Child Development Center, Community Education Center, and the Rosemead Center verified the adequacy and quality of those facilities.

The College utilizes a room usage database that analyzes the efficiency of classroom and laboratory usage. The Fall Student Survey 2012 indicated that 62 percent of respondents were satisfied with the quality of classroom and lab facilities. The College's commitment to

40

safety at the Main Campus and off-campus sites is evidenced by the 24-hour Police and Safety Department as well as safety-based trainings for faculty and staff. In addition, the College has invested resources into a state-of-the-art Emergency Operations Center. The institution has supported the equipment needs of distance delivery by investing in the Canvas Learning Management System. (Standard III.B.1)

The Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan guide the planning of buildings through the needs of programs and services. Measure P was approved by voters in 2002. Progress on building renovations and new construction through Measure P include a new Campus Center; Industrial Technologies Building; PCC Center for the Arts; elevator upgrades for Buildings C, E, and R; a five-level parking structure; restroom upgrade; and Building B classroom upgrades and expansion. In 2009, the College engaged in a seismic review of all structural facilities on the Main Campus. Subsequent studies resulted in the decision to vacate the U Building due to safety concerns. The decision to vacate the U Building resulted in Natural Science courses being moved to modular classrooms installed in a parking lot. In addition, Health Science courses and programs were moved to the Community Education Center. The College Council Facilities Standing Committee advises the College Council on matters relating to facilities related projects and programs. The program review process is utilized to monitor shorter-term needs. (Standard III.B.1.a)

The College complies with federally mandated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), seismic safety requirements, and Division of the State Architect (DSA) regulations. All existing facilities at the four sites meet ADA access requirements. In 2012, the College performed a campus-wide accessibility compliance assessment to identify any areas of noncompliance. The College's commitment to safety at the Main Campus and off-campus sites is demonstrated by the 24-hour Police and Safety Department as well as safety based trainings for faculty and staff. At off-site facilities, the College provides officers and cadets at the Child Development Center, Community Education Center, and the Rosemead Center. The Clery Report is published on the District Police website. The College's Emergency Preparedness Plan is currently being developed and is in draft form. (Standard III.B.1.b)

The College is in the process of updating its Facilities Master Plan or "Centennial Facilities Master Plan." An interview with the Executive Director of Facilities and Construction indicated that while the College is behind its original timeline for completion of the updated Facilities Master Plan, plans are in place to complete the updated Facilities Master Plan by May 2016. It was indicated to the team that an external firm will soon be selected to prepare this updated Facilities Master Plan. Ongoing assessment of its facilities is done primarily through visual inspections by College staff. (Standard III.B.2)

The College's Facilities Master Plan was last updated in 2010. The College uses program and unit reviews, demographic and enrollment data, campus surveys, unit and area plans, strategic goals, and the Educational Master Plan to address and evaluate the use of all facilities. Total cost of ownership is factored into new facility projects. (Standard III.B.2.a)

Facility needs are included in program reviews. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) has developed a rubric and provides detailed feedback for each program review. It

appears that program reviews are reviewed and considered when making facility decisions. While program reviews have been used to improve facilities, its use is not systematic. The team observed no evidence that the College systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation in integrated planning as the basis for improvement. (Standard III.B.2.b)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard III.B, except III.B.2.b.

Pasadena City College is a well maintained and safe campus with a blend of historic buildings and newly constructed buildings. Despite this blend of new and old, the College is commended for maintaining the historic and iconic features in its "look and feel" throughout its building projects. Measure P funds have enabled the College to complete most of the projects in the College's 2010 Facilities Master Plan.

The College has improved in its use of institutional planning for improvement, but must fully integrate physical resources planning into the overall planning processes.

Recommendations

See Recommendation 1.

Standard III - Resources
Standard III.C - Technology Resources

General Observations

Pasadena City College's (PCC) mission and Education Master Plan both support technology resources by defining the needs of student learning. The mission statement partially states the following: "fostering a dynamic and creative learning environment that is technologically, intellectually and culturally stimulating," and the Education Master Plan identifies the College's overarching critical priorities and strategies in relation to technology needs.

PCC has aggressively developed a Technology Implementation Plan that implemented a new Administrative Information System (Banner/LancerPoint), the Smart 18 Initiative that upgraded classrooms to "smart" status, the redesign of the website, and is upgrading the network infrastructure.

PCC's Information Technology Department was reorganized in 2011 by functional areas to better serve the needs of the College. The areas were divided into the Enterprise Applications/Services and the Technical Services, with the intention of reporting to the Vice President of Information Technology Services.

Findings and Evidence

The College's technology planning is embedded in both the mission and the Education Master Plan (EMP). The EMP critical priorities and strategies for technology are as follows: identify and address the technology needs and leadership that support the successful operations of the institution, identify and address the technology needs that support innovative teaching and learning methodologies, identify and address the technology needs that sustain all student support services and the library, and identify and address students' technology training needs to prepare them for technology driven professions. The College's Technology Plan was last completed in 2006 and is currently being updated. (Standard III.C)

The College used campus wide surveys and evaluations, and hired an outside consulting firm to assess the technology in use in 2009 and develop a Technology Implementation Plan to address the aging technology. The College replaced an old Administrative Information System that was not integrated, updated classrooms with smart technology, improved wireless networking, improved the College website and switched from Blackboard to Canvas to improve online education. The report from SIG suggested the reorganization of Information Technology and the hiring of a Chief Technology Officer. The College did hire a Vice President of Information Technology Services (VPITS) in August 2011 and reorganized the Information Technology Department into two functional areas managed by two directors: Enterprise Applications/Services and Technical Services. Since 2011 the VPITS position was vacated and discontinued. The two area directors now report to the Acting Assistant Superintendent/Senior Vice President, Business and College Services. The College organization chart has the directors reporting directly to the Executive Director of Business

Services position that is currently vacant. The College does not have immediate plans to fill the VPITS, but have recently hired a Manager of IT Support Services to assist the Director of Technical Services. The College and SIG also identified the need for a disaster recovery plan to ensure the operation of the Administrative Information System in the event of a disaster. (Standards III.C.1 and III.C.1.a, c and d)

The College's aggressive implementation of a new Administrative Information System (Banner), a new online learning platform (Canvas) and smart technology to classrooms has created the need for training for both staff and students. The College offered workshops and has online training videos for staff needing assistance for both LancerPoint/Banner and the online learning platform Canvas. The College also has an extensive training website for students utilizing Canvas for online courses. (Standard III.C.1.b)

The College's Technology Plan was last completed in 2006 and one area noted in the plan was the aging desktop and notebook computers. The College currently replaces desktops and notebooks when circumstances dictate the need, e.g. most desktops that interfaced with LancerPoint were replaced, or when a desktop or notebook dies, it is replaced. The current inventory of desktops over five years old is at 14 percent. The College is currently updating the Technology Plan that will include a desktop/notebook computer replacement plan on a five year rotation. The College has also used surveys, evaluations and an outside consultant to identify areas for improvement. This was clearly stated in the Self Evaluation Report, with the major upgrades to the Administrative Information System, the upgrading to classrooms, the improvement to the College website, wireless access and the switch made to a different online learning platform. While work is underway to update the Technology Plan, it is extremely outdated and is not fully integrated with other College planning processes. (Standard III.C.2)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard III.C, except III.C.2.

The College has aggressively responded to the need for new technology resources with the new Administrative Information System and other improvements, but without an updated Technology Plan, some of the College's outdated technology may not be addressed and, in the event of a disaster, the Administrative Information System may not operate for a period of time.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #1.

Standard III - Resources
Standard III.D - Financial Resources

General Observations

Pasadena City College's mission is supported by financial resources, which is evident when touring the campus. The College has made significant improvements to facilities, with new buildings and other improvements. The technology has been significantly updated and has made the commitment to support staff and students using the Banner system, the online instruction software Canvas and smart classroom technology. The College's Foundation supports the College mission with contributions to building projects, scholarships to students and other activities.

The College is supporting student learning with various tutoring labs, First Year Experience Programs, a Veterans Support Office and a very active student government. In 2009 a new Campus Center was built that supports students with a bookstore, cafeteria, student lounge and Student Association Office.

Findings and Evidence

Pasadena City College's mission partly states "to provide a high-quality, academically robust learning environment that encourages, supports and facilitates student learning and success." The College does support a robust learning environment and was evidenced throughout the campus by observing the many programs available to students. The mission is clearly the foundation of financial planning. (Standard III.D.1)

The integration of financial planning was described in the Self Evaluation Report, which stated that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) makes broad recommendations to the College based on improvement items identified in program and unit reviews and that the Budget and Resource Allocation Committee (BRAC) advises on matters relating to institutional-wide budget and resource allocation. The team was able to attend a BRAC meeting during the visit and observe the budget development instructions for the 2015-16 fiscal year. The instructions included several forms for budget administrators to prepare and included a budget summary request form, an updatable organization chart to identify new positions, a fixed asset form, a refurbishment and capital projects form, an unmet/critical needs justification form, and a services and supplies form. Many of the forms require a review from the IEC for verification of identified program review needs. (Standards III.D.1.a and d)

The budget development process used for the 2015-16 fiscal year has not been used for several years because of the past economic downturn; a roll-over budget was used in its place. The team had concerns regarding the program review cycle, since program reviews occur anywhere from two to six years and the updating of financial resource needs is not updated during these cycles. Some areas or departments have started the program review process but appear not to be complete with determining financial resource needs. (Standards III.D.1.a, b)

Pasadena City College has sufficient resources that support student learning and services. The College maintains general fund reserves in excess of the required 5 percent to cover unanticipated costs and emergencies. PCC's 2014-15 general fund budget includes a Board designated reserve of $12,050,000 and a contingency amount of $6,934,695. The reserve and contingency total of $18,984,695 represents 14.85 percent of total expenditures of the general fund. The College has maintained a sizable reserve over the past five years averaging 17 percent. The reserve has enabled the College to weather the economic downturn and not resort to layoffs during the "Great Recession." (Standard III.D.1.c)

PCC's Measure P $150 million construction bond was passed in 2002, which enabled the College to build several new buildings and a parking structure, and upgrade restrooms and elevators. The College made a commitment to a Technology Implementation Plan that was developed from input from an outside consulting firm.

The College has a designated fund for their Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), but to date has not established an irrevocable trust. At the end of the 2013-14 fiscal year, the fund balance in this account was $15,547,270 with an obligation of $5,449,988. (Standard III.D.1.c)

The College's 2012, 2013 and 2014 external audits of the District, Proposition 39 General Obligation Bond, and the Foundation have all received an unmodified opinion. The 2014 District audit identified six findings that were considered "significant deficiencies," but not considered "material weaknesses;" one was noted in the 2013 audit. The 2013 and 2014 finding on "to be arranged hours" will be resolved with the new Administrative Information System, LancerPoint/Banner. The College's audits can be reviewed on-line. The College's annual financial reports (CCFS 311s) and quarterly reports (CCFS 311-Qs) that were submitted to the Chancellor's Office for the past three years, along with the trend analysis, were reviewed by the team. (Standards III.D.2.a-d)

The College's Foundation is audited yearly and works with the College in supporting its mission by supporting scholarships, grants and capital improvements.

The College's new Administrative Information System software, Banner, has added extra control mechanisms by integrating 65 ancillary system programs and by having approval authorizations required for requisitions. (Standards III.D.2 and III.D.3.h)

The College has maintained a large general fund reserve, and, in the coming budget year, the College is planning for growth that will bring additional revenue. The College has use inter-fund borrowing from the self-insurance fund in the amount of $10,000,000 for cash flow purposes in the 2013-14 fiscal year. The self-insurance fund is primarily for Other Post-Employee Benefits (OPEB). Since the OPEB is currently held at the county treasury, the fund is not earning the potential earnings if held in a trust. The College has an actuarial plan that is updated every two years. (Standards III.D.3.a-e)

The 2014 District audit included a finding that timely calculations were not performed for some students who either withdrew or did not meet academic progress for Return to Title IV

Financial Aid. The College recently implemented the Financial Aid module of the Banner system and procedures were not in place to monitor the Return to Title IV. The College is revising current policy/procedures to ensure timely and accurate calculations. (Standard III.D.3.f)

The College budget process allocates dollars on an annual basis for payment of debt and contractual agreements. The College has a Director of Purchasing and Contracts Administration and a General Counsel on staff to review contractual agreements, and agreements must be approved by one of them prior to signing. The budget process allocates the funding necessary to meet its obligations. (Standard III.D.3.g)

Pasadena City College's financial resource planning is evolving and two plans are currently under review: the Centennial Facilities Master Plan and the Technology Plan. The College's recent planning for the allocation of resources is reliant on input from program review, but some departments or areas either do not participate or need further work and updating of their financial resource needs. The planning process and the allocation of resources was recently revised to give areas or departments the opportunity to request unmet needs and other resources and have not gone through a cycle so further evaluation can be completed. (Standard III.D.4)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard III.D, except III.D.4.

Financial resource allocations have been completed in the past with broad recommendations from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and advice from the Budget and Resource Allocation Committee. The College has recently refined the budget process to include direct input from the areas or departments based on program review data, but because some of the areas or departments are not participating in program review, program reviews are only updated on a long cycle of review, the financial resource needs are not identified in some program reviews, and the recently revised allocation process has not been through a full cycle, the College has not fully integrated its financial allocation of resources.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #1.

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance
Standard IV.A – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

At Pasadena City College, board policies and procedures are in place to define the roles of constituent groups in the shared governance process. Additionally, board policies and procedures are in place to support institutional improvement and effectiveness. Unfortunately, the systematic and ongoing implementation of those policies and procedures is not fully realized, resulting in a dysfunctional campus climate where shared governance is not respected or actualized. Residual mistrust, unprofessional behavior, and a lack of civility still permeates through and among faculty and administration; however, through interviews with constituent groups, the team found there is a sense of optimism that the environment on campus is changing.

Findings and Evidence

The College uses evidence to document its compliance with the standard in that the goals of the College are identified in the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and the Board of Trustees Annual Goals. The evaluation of administrators is tied to achieving those goals. Additionally, the policies for hiring administrators are aligned with the College's "Institutional Core Values." The Board of Trustees (Board) adopted policies and procedures for "A Code of Ethics" that was vetted and agreed to by faculty, management, classified staff and students. Despite that these policies and procedures are in place, the College does not fully follow them, and the need exists for all constituent groups to embrace and demonstrate compliance with Board Policy 2715-Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, AP 3050-Professional Ethics of Faculty, AP 3060-Professional Ethics of Management, and AP 3070-Professional Ethics of Classified Staff. The College provided evidence of a commitment to the institutional values and improvement by the recent addition of an "ethics" check-in by each constituent group at College Coordinating Council meetings. Through interviews of most constituent groups, there is a shared opinion that effective leadership was not present for several years, spanning two presidencies prior to the current interim Superintendent/President. (Standard IV.A)

In 2010 there was wide participation from constituent groups in the development of the EMP, which was corroborated through interviews with constituent groups. The Self Evaluation Report offered the EMP, the Board Policy on Shared Governance, and the Student Access and Success Initiative (SASI) as examples of how the College meets the standards for creating an environment for empowerment, innovation and excellence. The Board allocated one million dollars in 2011-12 to fund selected projects through the SASI program. The evaluation of applications was a transparent participatory process that started with the Academic Senate and included staff and administrator input in the rating of applications. However, without well communicated rationale, the rating process was abruptly changed in 2012-13 from one of transparency and participation to one where the applications were reviewed solely by an administrative team. This practice continued for 2013-14. By 2014-15 some of the original SASI projects were institutionalized, but the SASI model for funding and empowering faculty,

staff, and administrators for innovative ideas ended. Although the SASI model is no longer used, there is an expressed desire by new administrative leaders to revisit a new model to recognize innovation and excellence. However, no evidence was presented to substantiate that this is an institutionally shared plan of action, particularly from faculty. Student representatives felt that they had an equal voice on committees, and processes were in place to introduce new ideas for the College.

The classified staff agreed that they have an equal voice on committees when allowed to serve. Although policies exist to encourage classified staff to participate in shared governance activities and committees, actual participation was not systemically or institutionally practiced and supported by all administrators, resulting in diminishing engagement from classified staff in governance over the past six years. Participation from classified staff in the governance process is not robust and reflects a lack of administrative support. No evidence was produced to substantiate that systemic participative processes are effectively used to assure the ongoing implementation for institutional improvement. (Standard IV.A.1)

The College established Board Policy 2000-Shared Governance which was reviewed and/or revised in 2008. It encourages participatory roles of faculty, staff, management and students. Implementation of policies for all constituent groups is found in Administrative Procedures (APs) 2000-2000.40 that outlines the role of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, students, and managers in participatory governance. AP 2000.50 also establishes the role of the College Coordinating Council, and AP 2000.60 for the Council on Academic and Professional Matters. Both the Classified Senate and the Associated Students felt they had an equal voice on committees and that they had sufficient opportunities to bring forth individual ideas from their constituencies. The evidence presented does substantiate policies and procedures to define the roles of faculty and administrators in institutional governance, but full engagement of those policies and procedures is lacking. There were strong opinions expressed by faculty, staff and students that there has been a lack of "closing the loop" of communicating decisions made by the Board and/or administration that were contrary to recommendations made by the Academic Senate and other constituent groups. Evidence was offered during the visit by administrative representatives through team interviews that the relationship between the Board/administration and faculty/staff/students has improved over the past six months, yet little evidence was provided establishing that mechanisms for sustained input into institutional decision-making has been fully implemented. (Standard IV.A.2.a)

Board Policy 2000-Shared Governance establishes the Academic Senate as the body that makes recommendations on academic and professional matters, including those items related to student learning programs and services: curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, educational program development, and processes for program review. Board Policy 3200-Curriculum Development, Adoption, and Review establishes the Curriculum and Instruction committee (C&I) as the committee responsible to facilitate, coordinate, and maintain quality control for the process of curriculum review and development. However, the policy also states, "The expertise for curriculum development and innovation resides, though not exclusively, with the faculty." Policies and procedures are in place for the Academic Senate and C&I to make recommendations for student learning programs and services, however it is clear from faculty interviews that the role of the

Academic Senate and C&I are not clearly understood within the parameters of "mutually agreed upon" practice as it applies to Assembly Bill (AB) 1725's "10+1" interactions with and recommendations to the Board. What also has been evidenced is the lack of meaningful communication between the Board/senior administration and the Academic Senate. (Standard IV.2.b)

Board policies define the roles for all constituent groups in the governance processes at PCC. It is clear that over the past six years since the last comprehensive evaluation, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff and students have not worked together for the good of the institution. There are examples of excellent work and programs on campus, but their success appears to be isolated rather than the results of systemic integrated planning, using established and practiced procedures. Over the past six years, effective communication has deteriorated, and has manifested into a power struggle specifically between administration, Board, and the Academic Senate, with culpability on all parties that are interfering with the operation and improvement of the College. This has created a campus climate that has been toxic at times, and certainly does not reflect collegiality among constituent groups. Classified staff expressed feelings of being disenfranchised and marginalized in shared governance, which has had a negative effect on morale campus-wide. The low morale is substantiated by the 2014 Campus Climate Survey, which shows high levels of dissatisfaction in eight of the ten categories of the survey. Active participation on college committees is not robust and although optimism has been expressed by administration that the climate is improving, there is no substantive evidence that demonstrates full institutional implementation for improvement. The new/interim senior administrative team recognizes that there has been and continues to be significant strife and conflicts between administration and faculty, and there are several ideas in development/discussion stage to make shared governance a reality, but implementation has not occurred. With the perceived improvement in the campus climate, this may be an opportune time for the College to engage in an intentional and facilitated intervention with all campus leadership to establish concrete outcomes for the institution's governance and decision-making processes. This recent Self Evaluation Report is silent that the College meets this standard. (Standard IV.3)

Through its policies and procedures, PCC does agree to comply with the Accrediting Commission's Standards, policies, guidelines and requirements. The College is consistent in compliance, and whereas the College may move expeditiously in responding to Commission recommendations, the implementation and sustained application of procedures to ensure continuous quality improvement are not always met. (Standard IV.A.4)

The College has implemented a variety of campus climate surveys administered to students, staff, administrators, and faculty. The results have been shared with all constituent groups, and to a lesser degree, the results have been discussed in different forums. However, during interviews with campus personnel, it was emphasized that even though discussions did occur, very little action has been taken to systematically assess and implement necessary changes to structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness to improve the institution. What is lacking is effective shared action to clearly define and improve the structures and processes, and truly integrated planning for institutional improvement. The interviews with all campus constituent groups and the Board indicated that the current interim

Superintendent/President and his administrative team are taking the institution in the right direction, but it will be a long process to establish trust within the District. (Standard IV.A.5)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard IV.A, except IV.A.1, 3 and 5.

The College does have policies and procedures in place to meet the Standards, yet there is a major disconnect between those policies and procedures and their effective use as they relate to nearly every subsection of the Standard. Shared governance roles are defined but not honored or practiced. The constituent groups do not work together in the best interests of the College. The Academic Senate has been at odds and in a power struggle with the administration for several years, and the actions of the Academic Senate have strayed from its mission to the College. Effective leadership and communication from faculty and administration is lacking, and a true practice of shared or participatory governance is not effective and impedes continuous quality improvement of the College.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #4.

Recommendation #7
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that institutional leaders use transparent participatory processes; follow Board policies for soliciting input from all constituent groups for institutional decision making; and model collegial communication specifically among the Board, President and Academic Senate, for the goal of working together to demonstrate an environment of empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence for the good of the institution. (Standards IV.A.1; IV.A.3 and IV.B.1.e)

Recommendation #8
In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendation #6 (2009), the team recommends that the institution regularly and systematically evaluates organization structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness, communicates those evaluations to the College, and uses the results of those evaluations as a basis for improvement. (Standard IV.A.5).

Standard IV – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard IV.B – Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

Pasadena City College board policies are in place regarding roles, responsibilities, delegation of authority, standards of conduct, and shared governance. The policies are being updated and are clearly identified on the website. The Board acts as an independent body with members representing their constituents in identified geographic areas. Board policies and goals are supportive of student learning and success. Members have not consistently adhered to policies, particularly in the areas of shared governance and ethical standards.

The previous Superintendent/President made progress on the College's Educational and Facilities Master Plans. He demonstrated fiscal responsibility through the growth of outside funding and strong management of the operational budget. Under his leadership, shared governance and communication deteriorated, resulting in lack of trust and poor morale. Collegial consultation needs to be addressed and future progress measured on a consistent basis.

The evidence provided in the Self Evaluation Report was incomplete and did not consistently support statements made. Additional evidence was found by searching the website or upon request during the site visit.

Findings and Evidence

Board Policy 2410 clearly outlines the Board's role in policy setting, the Superintendent/ President's role in recommending policies and operating the District, and roles of the college community and public in contributing to policy formation. (Standard IV.B)

Board Policy 0200 defines the College's mission, which is focused on student learning success, and numerous other policies exist in support of student learning programs and services. The Board sets annual goals for the College including items related to learning and success. Six mission critical priorities identified in the current Educational Master Plan are clearly supportive of student learning programs and services. (Standard IV.B.1)

Board goals and policies are in place regarding fiscal stability, and annual presentations are made as the budget is adopted. Funding requests that come before the Board are aligned with the priorities in the Educational Master Plan. (Standards IV.B.1 and IV.B.1.c)

A board policy is in place for the selection of the Superintendent/President (BP 2431). The policy states that the Board has sole responsibility for establishing a process that is fair, open, and complies with relevant regulations. Guidelines for the process include seeking input from the campus community regarding the desirable characteristics in a Superintendent/ President, the formation of a screening committee to assist in evaluating the pool of candidates, interviews by the Board, and a background check. The guidelines for the

screening committee composition call for the inclusion of faculty, classified staff, managers, students, and community members; however, the Board has the authority to change the structure. This process was used in 2009 for the selection of the past Superintendent/ President and is currently taking place at the College for the selection of the next Superintendent/President. Members of the Academic Senate stated that they were included in the screening committee, that they desired to participate in interviews, and that open forums are planned. Board members stated that input from the campus had been sought regarding desired characteristics, but limited suggestions were provided.

A board policy is also in place for evaluation of the Superintendent/President (BP 2435). According to interviews with Human Resources, evaluations of the past Superintendent/ President were conducted. This policy was revised in August 2012, with the Superintendent/ President's evaluation to reflect progress made on the Educational Master Plan and annual Board goals. The process is conducted over a four-year cycle with the first three years serving as annual developmental evaluations as determined through mutual agreement between the Superintendent/President and the Board. During the fourth year, a comprehensive evaluation is completed using an external, independent consultant who is to conduct the evaluation and to gather broader attributed comments in person from faculty, staff, administration and students. Concerns from faculty have been raised regarding the infrequency of campus input and lack of anonymity. The Academic Senate passed a resolution requesting a return to the previous policy. At the time of the site visit, no response had been received from the Board. (Standards IV.B.1 and IV.B.1.j)

The Board is an independent policy-making body and the seven members represent constituents from their respective geographic areas. A student trustee is elected annually and represents students' interests. Policies are in place to define the roles and responsibilities of Board members. At times the Board has not acted as a whole; the newest member has made public statements that were not in agreement with previous Board decisions and has, independent of the Board, directed College staff. According to information gathered from interviews, there are concerns about this behavior, and it has been addressed through informal feedback and training. Additional evidence was provided during the site visit regarding Board training on the Brown Act and appropriate board behavior. (Standard IV.B.1.a)

The Board has established policies consistent with the mission and supportive of student learning. These polices are aligned with annual Board goals and with the Educational Master Plan. The Board has supported student learning by allocating resources including one-time funding for programs, grant funding, and the commitment of general funds. (Standard IV.B.1.b)

Through policy, the Board appropriately retains ultimate responsibility for the integrity of the College's educational quality, legal matters, and financial status. The Board is authorized through its policies to retain legal counsel as required in fulfillment of its obligations. (Standard IV.B.1.c)

Board policies are published on the website, including those describing Board roles and responsibilities. The College is currently in the process of updating policies and procedures and has established separate sites to distinguish existing from proposed policies. (Standards IV.B.1.d and e)

The Board has not always acted in a manner consistent with its own policies, with particular concern regarding BP 2000 on shared governance and BP 2715 on ethics and standards of practice. Review of the Self Evaluation Report and information received during the site visit presented conflicting views of how decisions have been made and whether policies were appropriately followed. A pervasive theme, however, was the lack of collegiality and the escalation of disrespectful behavior that occurred under the previous Superintendent/ President. While all parties acknowledged improvement over the past six months, the deterioration of participative decision-making in the four years leading up to the visit have resulted in damaged relationships, a lack of trust, and poor morale.

Winter intersession is a lingering issue that demonstrates how the current campus environment came into being. According to the report and substantiated during interviews, the Board approved the removal of the 2013 winter intersession upon recommendation from the previous Superintendent/President. This decision was made in August 2012 without thorough vetting through shared governance bodies. The reactions from the campus were volatile with large audiences showing up for Board meetings to contest the decision. At some point during this ongoing debate, security officers began bag searches of those attending Board meetings, and meeting admission was denied when the room reached its fire code capacity. Two individuals were arrested for assaulting an officer and a cadet. When asked about this situation during interviews, there were those who agreed with how these meetings were handled, while others stated it violated the Brown Act and participative decision making. At the time of the site visit, there was little consensus about whether to include a winter intersession, although all parties reported that a collegial dialogue had taken place on campus and the interim Superintendent/President clearly explained his reasons for not including it in the next academic year.

Another unresolved dispute is the organizational structure for the College. Numerous employees indicated that sufficient dialog did not take place and that little consideration was given to faculty and staff concerns. Based on the report and information gathered during interviews, there is confusion about the organizational structure and it remains in flux. Multiple organizational charts have been created over the past few years, numerous individuals are in interim assignments, and job descriptions are not in place.

The matter began early in the tenure of the previous Superintendent/President when he proposed an atypical structure for a community college. One person interviewed stated it was based on the structure at UCLA (the University of California-Los Angeles). The campus spent much of the 2011-2012 academic year studying and discussing the proposal. Two task forces were formed to analyze the impact and were asked to make recommendations on the proposed structure and the establishment of department chairs. It was reported that one task force recommended the College continue with its traditional structure. The recommendations from the second task force studying department chairs are unknown. Although the dialogue

was to culminate at a town hall meeting, it is unclear if this took place. In August 2012, the Board approved the new structure recommended by the previous Superintendent/President. At the time of the site visit, no resolution regarding department chairs had been reached and there is conflict over the amount of reassigned time some faculty are receiving to perform administrative work.

These two examples illustrate the gaps in participative decision making and the escalation of uncivil behavior throughout the College. Votes of no confidence from the Academic and Student Senates took place in spring 2013, the Council on Academic and Professional Matters stopped functioning in 2013-2014 as a result of Academic Senate members boycotting the meeting, and the Academic Senate president declined to sign the Self Evaluation Report in December 2014. At some point and without notice, constituency representatives were removed from the dais at Board meetings, although they have now returned to the platform.

The Board has worked on resolving shared governance problems beginning with a technical assistance visit from two statewide organizations in spring 2014. It is considering hiring a consultant to facilitate discussions on improving campus relations. In fact, the Board Goals for 2014-2017 include specific actions to "promote trust and a shared vision for institutional success through effective communication and an enhanced system of shared governance." They also participated in training on the Brown Act in February 2015. During the site visit, the three members interviewed expressed genuine concern about these issues and described their intent to improve communication with the campus community. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

A program for Board development and new member orientation is described in Board policies and has been conducted on a regular basis. Enhancements to the orientation for new members were recently added and will include providing a mentor early in the Board member's term. Development activities have included local programming and external conference attendance. Continuity of membership is ensured by staggered terms of office and vacancies have been filled in an open and transparent manner. (Standard IV.B.1.f)

Board policies are in place regarding self-evaluation which has taken place on an annual basis. The evaluation instrument was revised in 2014 in the spirit of continuous improvement and in response to the 2014 campus climate survey results. Board goals for 2014-2017 address concerns about the campus climate and include action plans for the Board. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

The Board established an updated code of ethics in 2014 that includes a clearly defined process for dealing with behavior that violates the code. The process has been used at times in the past year to address behavior that violates policy. (Standard IV.B.1.h)

The Board has been regularly informed about and involved in the accreditation process. Members have participated in training at the local level and at conferences. Updates on the accreditation Self Evaluation Report were provided over the past two years at Board meetings and during study sessions and Board members had the opportunity to provide feedback. Policies are in place regarding the accreditation process. (Standard IV.B.1.i)

The Superintendent/President's roles and responsibilities are defined by Board policy and include overseeing the quality of the institution. Four presidents have presided over the College during this accreditation cycle. In between the terms of the two permanent Superintendent/Presidents, one interim served for nine months and another interim is currently in place. The Superintendent/President in place for the majority of this cycle served from July 2010 through August 2014. During his tenure, the report describes and evidence is provided of effective planning with the creation of a comprehensive Educational Master Plan and the launch of facilities master planning. Fiscal and budgetary leadership was demonstrated by the dramatic increases in grant funds, Foundation funds, strong reserves and a well-managed operating budget. Communication with community groups was enhanced with the formation of advisory groups for Latinos, African Americans, and Asian and Pacific Islanders. Funding was provided for student success initiatives and increases were seen in degrees awarded, success rates, transfer velocity, and retention rates.

While the specific achievements above contributed to the College's progress, the quality of the institution's participatory governance and communication processes declined. Leadership by the previous Superintendent/President resulted in a campus climate of low trust and poor morale. A review of the campus climate surveys conducted in 2011 and 2014 shows evidence of deterioration in collegial consultation and lack of confidence in senior leadership. For example, an item regarding open communication from senior leadership decreased among all constituents from 35 percent to 10 percent agreeing and increased from 22 percent to 64 percent disagreeing. Similar changes were seen on items related to believing senior leadership, senior leadership taking a genuine interest in employees, and clarity about the role of faculty in shared governance. The Academic Senate and Associated Students passed votes of no confidence in 2013 as a result of decisions made by the Superintendent/President and the lack of collegial consultation. (Standard IV.B.2)

As previously described, one area of contention has been the reorganization of the College. The interim Superintendent/President has verbally committed to having dialogue about the College's structure and receiving input from constituencies. Clear structures, definitive job descriptions and performance expectations are needed. (Standard IV.B.2.a)

The previous Superintendent/President guided the improvement of learning through the development of the Educational Master Plan, with numerous goals focused on learning and success. A collegial process and the use of high quality research were evident. He also funded the Student Access and Success Initiative (SASI) to promote innovative programs and services such as the First Year Pathways program. During the first year of SASI, the Academic Senate was involved in selecting projects; in subsequent years, senior management selected the projects. The SASI program has now been eliminated as a result of negative perceptions; a process for one-time funding will need to be developed as a replacement. Evidence of high quality research and analysis is documented including a variety of demographics and student success data that are shared with the campus via the "Observations" reports and website. The Superintendent/President is described as having used this and other data for planning purposes. The most recent data on this particular site is from 2012-2013 and only a few reports from 2013-2014 were posted online. An explanation

provided during interviews stated that the website has been undergoing major improvements and up-to-date research results will be posted in the near future. (Standard IV.B.2.b)

An area of controversy described above was the change to the academic calendar involving the elimination of the 2013 winter intersession. The report produced by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in April 2013 states that multiple factors are involved in producing outcomes and caution should be used in interpreting the data about the impact of removing winter intersession. It is unclear what data the Superintendent/President used to make the decision about the removal of the winter intersession. (Standard IV.B.2.b)

Through Board policy, the Superintendent/President is delegated authority for assuring the implementation of statutes, regulations, and policies, and assuring practices are consistent with the institution's mission and policies. The Superintendent/President relies upon advice from the College Coordinating Council and senior management to ensure the implementation of polices is consistent with the College mission. (Standard IV.B.2.c)

The Superintendent/President has effectively controlled the College budget and expenditures. The College received a credit rating of AA+ from S&P and Aa2 from Moody's, has planned for coverage of retirement liabilities, and has a balanced budget for 2014-2015. In 2013-2014, the College exceeded its FTE goal to generate an additional $2.9 million in revenue. During the previous Superintendent/President's tenure, $26 million in grants was obtained and $7 million in donations to the Foundation. (Standard IV.B.2.d)

The previous Superintendent/President worked and communicated effectively with the community. Communication with community groups was enhanced with the formation of advisory groups for Latinos, African Americans, Armenians and Asian and Pacific Islanders. Community members were included in the development of the Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan. The Superintendent/President's outreach for the Foundation resulted in a dramatic increase in donations. The Superintendent/President also conducted numerous town hall meetings. (Standard IV.B.2.d)

Conclusion

The College meets all elements of Standard IV.B, except IV.B.1.e and h.

Policies are in place and have been through a recent review. The Board acts as an independent body. Members have participated in training, in self evaluation, and have made improvements. Board members have not consistently followed policies for shared governance and ethical standards. The previous Superintendent/President made progress on planning and fiscal management, but failed to provide leadership in areas related to institutional effectiveness and participatory governance. Progress has been made in the past six months in reinstituting collegial consultation and communication, but much more is needed to meet the Standards.

Recommendations

See Recommendations #4 and 7.