

Standard Three: Institutional Effectiveness

The institution, appropriate to its mission and purposes as a higher education institution, develops and implements a broad-based and integrated system of research, evaluation, and planning to assess institutional effectiveness and uses the results for institutional improvement. The institution identifies institutional outcomes, which can be validated by objective evidence.

A. Institutional Research and Evaluation

A.1 Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation.

Descriptive Summary

Three forces drive the research and evaluation needs of the college: the local college needs in areas such as program review, program development and evaluation, satisfaction and instructional methodology surveys, enrollment management, and accreditation reports; needs relating to this college's relationship to the Los Angeles Community College District, as one of the nine colleges within the district and required by the state of California to adhere to Management Information System requirements, federal reporting requirements, Board of Trustee inquiries, grant applications, legislative strategy, and policy decisions driven by Board Rules, Personnel Guides, and Administrative Regulations; occasional ad hoc collaborative efforts involving the colleges and the District Research and Reporting Unit (DRRU) arising from regional or programmatic projects.

The college receives data collection, analysis, and research support from two main bodies:

1. Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Office of Research and Planning (ORP)
2. District Research and Reporting Unit (DRRU).

The District-wide Research Committee (DRC), composed of researchers from the nine colleges, act collectively with representatives from the DRRU and other appropriate councils, evaluate needs and develop policy suggestions. Both of these entities have undergone significant changes over the past few years, affecting their ability to provide appropriate and timely information for the college.

The ORP is currently involved in the Educational Master Planning process. Working with Educational Planning Associates consultants, the ORP has contributed data and research on the college's service to the community, students, (including student demographics and long term enrollment trends), and student outcome measures, (including degree and certificate completion and course completion success).

One of the main factors previously undermining LATTC's institutional research and

planning has been the instability of the senior level administration between 1995, which marked the end of president Tom Steven's nineteen-year tenure, and 2000, marked by the appointment of the current interim president. Some LATTC faculty and staff nostalgically view the period from 1976 – 1995 as an era of stability, clear process and protocols, and campus cohesion. Campus instability is currently the result of an interim presidency and an inordinately high number of vacant administrative positions due to illness, transfers, retirements, and budget restraints. As a result, most of the recommendations from the last program review sequence completed in 1998-1999 were not implemented and evaluation and planning activities drifted until recently.

At this time, college, district and occasional regional or programmatic needs drive institutional research activities, conducted by the college's Office of Research and Planning (ORP), created in 2001, and/or the District Research and Reporting Unit (DRRU). The college remains relatively "invisible" to the public and surrounding communities.

Almost every person interviewed spoke of the dearth of leadership that followed Steven's retirement in 1995. After his departure, four presidents served for short periods of time before the appointed interim president. There is virtual unanimity that the period from 1995 to the present has been a very difficult time for the college – "years of shifting sands." According to the Triangle Report 2002 (Doc. 3.1) the following sentiments are shared by some members of the campus community: decisions were not made prior to Dr. Castro's appointment; there was "no inspiration;" there were "no champions;" people became "disgruntled and discouraged;" and that the college drifted.

Self Evaluation

The lack of a stable leadership left the college without the necessary vision and power to guide and direct the long-term decision-making and planning of the college.

Since 2001, the college has attempted to increase the level and integration of institutional research into the college's planning endeavors. This has been fueled by:

1. new college senior administration,
2. Proposition A, and its related Facilities and Educational master planning needs, and
3. the creation of the Office of Research and Planning, headed by the Dean of Research and Planning.

The institutional research data on the ORP website has allowed departments and programs to progress with grant writing projects and conducting campus surveys. In 2001-2002, it provided information to Disabled Student Programs and Services, EOP&S, and the nursing department in preparation for accreditation visits. The ORP was in constant dialogue with the Educational Master Plan consultants providing data and analysis of data. The ORP also provides background information and quantitative data about programs and student surveys for the college's new program review process. Institutional research has a tremendous impact on PAC, enrollment management, recruitment, class scheduling and campus grant writing and reporting.

Planning Agenda

Stable college leadership and vision is necessary to support institutional research in guiding and directing long term decision-making and college planning.

A.2 The institution provides the necessary resources for effective research and evaluation.

Descriptive Summary

The college's institutional research ability has undergone dramatic change since the 1997 Accreditation Site Visit. In 1999 the college's Research Analyst left LATTC to take a new position, leaving LATTC without institutional research support for a year. In 2000, an administrative analyst was selected from the Academic Affairs office to assume some responsibilities of institutional research.

With the change in college administration in 2000, renewed emphasis was placed upon institutional research needs and a new position of Associate Dean of Research and Planning was created. The position was filled in April 2001 and the Office of Research and Planning is currently in the process of hiring a new research analyst to assist with the increased demands on the office. When completed, the office will have two full-time researchers and one student worker.

Research data is currently stored and published on the office's website, <http://www.lattc.edu/dept/tisp/index.cfm>. The website allows the user to view enrollment trends, Full-time Time Enrolled Students (FTES) information, course success and retention, and student demographics. The site is designed so that website users can select semesters for comparison, and link from an overall campus level, to the section/class level. Survey instruments and results are also posted on the website allowing users to view survey results both numerically and graphically.

The District Research and Reporting Unit (DRRU) is supervised by the Senior Director of Institutional and Student Services. The current staffing level is at seven positions: four for research (one Senior Research Analyst, one Research Analyst, one Assistant Administrative Analyst, one Office Assistant) and three positions for reporting (one Senior Research Analyst and two Research Analysts). Half (0.5 FTE) of one of the Research Analyst positions in reporting is funded by Matriculation¹ and the other half by VATEA. As part of a 1998 district reorganization and decentralization initiative, DRRU staffing was cut from twelve positions in 1997-1998, to seven positions in 1998-1999. Lost positions included: one director, one administrative secretary, one administrative intern, one library technician, and one assistant administrative analyst.

Self Evaluation

The college has made an effort to rekindle its information and planning efforts, with the creation of the Associate Dean of Research and Planning position in 2001. Currently, the

¹ The District Matriculation Advisory Committee voted on 4/30/02 to discontinue funding for the DRRU. This decision must receive final approval from campus Chief Student Services Officer (CSSO.)

ORP website is available to the college community and public and provides access to student demographics, enrollment trends, and FTES information. Student, faculty, and staff survey data is posted online, and there is a link to the campus Accreditation Website for information dealing directly with the campus Accreditation Self-Study:

<http://www.lattc.edu/dept/tisp/accred/index.cfm>.

Department chairs, associate deans, and various representatives have attended training sessions in technology from counseling, admissions and records, and other areas in student and administrative services.

In regard to the resources available for research and planning, the college has provided ORP with a staff of a dean, a research analyst and a student worker. Whether this is sufficient for current and future plans is unknown at this point. An evaluation will be made in accordance with the office's program review process. The office has staff computers and the ability to publish data and research online, create surveys, and analyze data from institutional, survey, and extra-college sources.

The 2001 Faculty/Staff/Administrator survey provided insight into the campus perspective on institutional research efforts. Fifty-four percent of the administrators, the major users of research information, felt that the college does not provide enough support for institutional research.² This indicates a need to find out exactly what research needs the administrators have and then see how they can be addressed.

Even though the DRRU has a budgeted staff of seven, it has been unable to fill all of the positions. Currently the office has a senior research analyst, two research analysts, and one office assistant. The lack of personnel has adversely affected the office's ability to provide district-wide analyses. Within the past year, IPEDS and assessment validation reporting has been turned over to the individual campuses. The district-wide survey may also be moved from the DRRU and placed in the hands of the individual campus research offices.

Planning Agenda

The ORP undertook the following during summer and fall 2002:

1. A description of research information currently being provided for Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services.
2. Creation of research priorities in line with the recommendations of the master planning initiatives, strategic plan, and program review process.
3. Evaluation of workload of the above needs and the personnel needed to fulfill the college's research needs.
4. Assessment of computer software and hardware to meet both the research and personnel needs of the ORP.

² http://lattc.cc.ca.us/dept/tisp/accred/survey_graph.cfm?question=q20

The district decentralization initiative included an ad hoc task force on research and planning. The task force worked through the summer of 1998 and submitted its final report containing nine specific recommendations on September 29, 1998. The report was approved by the District Chancellor and the Chancellor's Cabinet (the nine college presidents) and presented to the Board of Trustees. The DRRU will undergo a review by a joint committee of district and campus representatives to review and redefine its role in providing support and information to the campuses and district office.

A.3 The institution has developed and implemented the means for evaluating how well, and in what ways, it accomplishes its mission and purposes.

Descriptive Summary

Following the 1997 Self-Study and accreditation evaluation team visit, the college held two planning retreats to evaluate the needs of the college and to create vision and mission statements for the college as well as a strategic plan. The first of these retreats, the Future Search Conference held on June 20, 1997, was used to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and priorities of the campus. The results of this retreat were published in a document that was distributed to the campus body. The second retreat, held a month later on July 18, 1997, followed up on the information from the first retreat to create a mission statement for the college and to develop goals, action plans, and indicators of effectiveness. Two documents were created containing the results of the retreats and were to be used to guide the college over the next several years. One stated:

The values, strategic intents, goals, recommended action plans, and indicators of effectiveness cited in the booklet will be refined, delineated, and acted-upon during the 1997-98 academic year as the college engages in collaborative, interactive strategic planning and formulates budgets, reviews programs and services, and implements improvements.³

The PAC, which serves as the main shared governance and planning body for the campus, distributed the retreat documents to its members in November 1998 asking them to focus on the college mission, values and strategic intents. The PAC held two retreats in 1999 to carry out the strategic intents developed at the college wide retreats.

Self Evaluation

Unfortunately, the efforts and resulting documents from these retreats were never implemented at the college. Over the next four years, the college experienced a tumultuous turnover in its senior level administration. A series of three presidents and numerous changes in vice presidents and deans left the college without the stable leadership necessary to implement the strategic plan created by the college in 1997.

³ *Transforming Vision Into Reality*. Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, College-Wide Retreat, July 18, 1997, p. 1.

This instability affected other areas of planning including program review, institutional research, assessment and campus cohesiveness, and purpose.

The PAC discussed the need to develop a Technology/ Facilities/Educational Master plan in spring of 1999; however, it was not until the LACCD bond measure Proposition A, passed in the spring of 2001 that a Facilities Master Plan was created, guided by the district office.

Planning Agenda

The college has created or is developing three master plans: one for facilities, one for educational programs, and one for technology. These plans will guide the college in carrying out its mission statement.

A vehicle or tool should be developed for providing periodic assessments and evaluations of the master plans to ensure they continue to support the vision and mission statements of the college.

The program review process for each college discipline or unit will provide current data that will help to monitor the effectiveness of the Educational, Facilities, and Technology Master Plans.

A.4 The institution provides evidence that its program evaluations lead to improvement of programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

The last program review sequence was completed in 1998-1999. A report by the program review committee, dated May 10, 1999, summarized the findings of the program review and gave funding recommendations in the area of equipment, personnel, and supplies. As stated earlier, the lack of a stable leadership and loss of institutional memory amongst the senior administration left the recommendations unused and unimplemented. As the Triangle report stated, "When plans are developed and then administrators change, the new administrators have little stake in what has been done before and do not follow through on previous plans."⁴ The college had made sincere efforts to evaluate its programs, but was lacking at the implementation level.

Self Evaluation

Similar to the responses on institutional research, the 2001 Faculty/Staff/Administrator Survey indicates that the campus body does not feel that planning issues have been appropriately or consistently addressed. Survey question twenty-seven reads "The college uses systematic planning and evaluation to improve programs and services," received an even 28 percent agreeing and 28 percent disagreeing with this statement. When broken down for administrators, 27 percent disagreed with this statement, while only 9 percent

⁴ *Ibid.*, Triangle Associates, Inc., 11.

agreed.⁵ This corresponds to the statement by the Triangle Associates report and indicates a need to follow through on program review evaluations and see that these documents do not collect dust, forgotten on someone's shelf.

The college has not sufficiently utilized its program review process to adjust and improve its programs. The constant leadership change and lack of Program Review enforcement has left many faculty and program directors without the desire to evaluate their programs. The lack of a current program review has critically impacted the campus Accreditation Self-Study process. This serious consequence is vigorously being addressed by the campus' current program review process, which began in the fall of 2002.

Planning Agenda

The college is reevaluating its program review process. Units from the three areas of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services have volunteered for the initial review cycle. Program review will be integrated into faculty hiring priorities, Block and Partnership for Excellence grant applications and awards, the campus budget cycle and overall college planning.⁶

B. Institutional Planning

B.1 The institution defines and publishes its planning processes and involves appropriate segments of the college community in the development of institutional plans.

Descriptive Summary

Following the 1997 Self-Study and Accreditation evaluation team visit, the college held two planning retreats to evaluate the needs of the college and to create vision and mission statements for the college as well as a strategic plan. The first of these retreats, the Future Search Conference held on June 20, 1997, was used to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and priorities of the campus. The results of this retreat were published in a document that was distributed to the campus body. The second retreat, held on July 18, 1997, followed up on the information from the first retreat to create a mission statement for the college and a strategic plan for implementing the goals of the mission statement, *Transforming Vision into Reality*.

Unfortunately, the efforts and resulting documents from these retreats were never implemented at the college. Over the next four years, the college experienced a tumultuous turnover in its senior level administration. A series of presidents and numerous changes in vice presidents and deans left the college without the stable leadership necessary to implement the strategic plan created by the college in 1997. This instability affected other areas of planning including program review, institutional research, assessment and campus cohesiveness, and purpose.

The PAC, which is the main planning committee on campus, is made up of twenty-one representatives from the different campus constituent groups (see Planning and Advisory

⁵ http://lattc.cc.ca.us/dept/tisp/accred/survey_graph.cfm?question=q27

⁶ Documents will be attached once they are finalized from the Program Review committee.

Committee Roster 2001-2002.). The number of campus representatives includes the following:

- College president - permanent member
- Vice presidents - three permanent members
- Academic Senate - four representatives
- AFT Faculty Guild - four representatives
- Associated Student Organization - two representatives
- Classified Administrators - two representatives
- Certificated Administrators - one representative
- AFT Staff Guild - one representative
- Classified Supervisors - one representative
- Local 99 - one representative
- Building Trades Unit - one representative
- Dean of Research and Planning serves as a non-voting, resource member.

The PAC develops and establishes criteria and recommendations for allocating college resources, including facilities and personnel. Subcommittees of the PAC include Budget, Facilities, Enrollment Management, and Retention. Monthly meetings are open to members of the college community and the public and guests are invited to speak and make presentations during the open sessions on the agenda.

Self Evaluation

The campus participated in a number of planning processes that have not progressed beyond the initial document creation stage. The PAC has moved forward in creating goals and documenting their achievement (Doc. 3.2). In some ways, PAC has remained unchanged from the previous Self-Study. “Some PAC members meet regularly with their constituent groups, but other members have no opportunity to convene formal meetings with their constituencies.”⁷ PAC members must relate the information that they receive to their constituencies to ensure campus wide buy-in and support for decisions. “Planning and Advisory Committee minutes indicate that the majority of meetings are spent discussing administrative issues, rather than long-range planning.”⁸ The PAC should strengthen its long-term planning capabilities by forming a specific long-term planning committee, or establishing an independent body that will create and administrate long-range planning for the college.

One of the major achievements of the PAC was the creation and adoption of a new mission statement for the college. The campus community including staff, students and faculty, provided input and suggestions for the new mission statement. Members of the campus community attended special sessions of the PAC to add their input into the

⁷ *Accreditation Self-Study 1997*, Standard One – 7.

⁸ *Ibid.*

mission statement process. The Associated Student Organization held their own meetings and drafted ideas and concepts that they wanted to see included in the college mission statement. The result of the PAC efforts was a mission statement that received input beyond the immediate members of the PAC. It has been widely circulated to the campus community.

The Triangle Associates report also recommends that the campus wide retreats of 1997 be reenacted under the current administration to bring about a current, comprehensive strategic plan for the college. The PAC may accomplish this task due to its membership and performance in involving the campus community in the development of a mission statement.

The Staff Bulletin, flyers, campus emails, college website, FLEX Day activities, news media, newsletters, brochures, Town Hall meetings, and the Staff Development office have been successful in informing the college community about the Facilities Master Plan, and the progress of the planned on and off-campus construction projects, workshops, PAC meetings, Academic Senate meetings, Program Review, Curriculum Committee meetings and the Accreditation Self-Study.

Planning Agenda

It is recommended that:

1. PAC members meet regularly and communicate with their colleagues and constituents regarding PAC issues;
2. The PAC investigate strengthening its long term planning capabilities by creating a PAC subcommittee or an independent committee for campus long range planning;
3. The college follow through with the Triangle Associates report recommendations for holding retreats to create a college strategic plan;
4. The college create guidelines and procedures that ensure that the future campus strategic plan is implemented, regardless of changes in senior administration;
5. The campus pursue the creation and adoption of the future college strategic plan by encouraging the collegial and effective participation of the college community, as was accomplished with the revision of the LATTC mission statement;
6. The PAC ensure the implementation of the college's future strategic plan;
7. The college continue to utilize the staff bulletin, flyers, campus emails, college website, FLEX Day activities, the news media, newsletters, brochures and other media formats, the Staff Development office and campus Town Hall meetings

to keep the college community and public involved and informed about the development and progression of institutional planning.

B.2 The institution defines and integrates its evaluation and planning processes to identify priorities for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

Following the creation of the *Future Search* and *Transforming Vision into Reality* documents, the college embarked on creating a program review process that integrated the mission statement and strategic intents of the college. A committee was formed with representatives from the various constituencies on the campus.⁹ The program review model incorporated the strategic intents of the college planning document.¹⁰ Programs and units reviewed their programs based upon the seven strategic intents of the college.

Master Planning

In 1996 the district office sponsored the creation of an Educational Master Plan for each college. Unfortunately, the faculty at LATTC felt that the “generic” Educational Master Plan created by the district’s consultants did not appropriately address the unique needs and environment of the college.¹¹ The college began reviewing the 1996 Educational Master Plan in November 2000 and adjusting it to meet the needs of LATTC. No final document was created or implemented for the college.

The college’s most recent Facilities Master Plan was created in 2001-2002. The main impetus for this document was the Proposition A monies that the college will receive to improve and expand the campus.¹² The Educational Master Plan was not up-to-date, leaving the college with an open Facilities Master Plan that will be adjusted based on the needs identified by the Educational Master Plan.

The Educational Master Plan began in the spring of 2002. The Educational Master Plan consultants, Educational Planning Associates integrated the Facilities Master Plan into their planning efforts. Johnson and Faverau, the Facilities Master Plan consultants, shared the information gleaned from their interviews and research with the Educational Master Plan consultants, providing the Educational Master Plan consultants with a working foundation.

Self Evaluation

Without a stable administration to guide the college, campus planning efforts have been for the most part disjointed and unconnected. The 1997 Strategic Plan and resulting

⁹ *Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Program Review Guidelines: 1998-1999.*

¹⁰ *Program Review: 1998-1999, General Questions: Instructional Programs, 8/14/98.*

¹¹ Interview with Leige Henderson, VP of Academic Affairs, LATTC, 4/30/2002.

¹² *Building for Our Future – Proposition A, Los Angeles Community College District.*

program review were the beginning of an integrated planning process, but the changes in administration prevented the continuation and implementation of the college's efforts.

Individual programs and departments have developed their own successful and beneficial projects and plans without the guidance of a campus wide plan. While these projects and improvements have been a tremendous benefit to the individual departments, these efforts are often unknown outside of the departments and lose their impact. As the Triangle Associate's report stated, "without a central vision around which to organize, departments and programs are moving at their own individual paces, in uncoordinated directions. No unified vision drives the college."¹³

The lack of a Technology Master Plan left the college with uncoordinated efforts to improve the technological capabilities and offerings of the college. Computer labs abound around the campus, created by individual departments and programs. These departments and programs, without the benefit of a Technology Master Plan, expended tremendous effort and resources to improve their course offerings and facilities. Yet, the many programs without computer facilities are often ignorant of the existence and availability of these labs. The lack of a campus wide technology plan has produced a college with bright points of technological development and improvement, surrounded by dark regions of technological stagnation.

With the influx of Proposition A funds, the college is at a point where tremendous positive change can occur, if the college creates an overarching, integrated planning process. The college needs sufficient master plans that have been integrated into a guiding strategic plan for the campus. In addition to the college plans, the institution requires an evaluation process that will be able to assess its implementation efforts and make adjustments as required.

Planning Agenda

The college mission statement will guide the college's strategic planning process that was begun in the summer of 2002.

The college will ensure that the master plans are integrated into the strategic planning process, and will follow through with plans for the creation of a Technology Master Plan in 2003.

B.3 The institution engages in systematic and integrated educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning and implements changes to improve programs and services.

Descriptive Summary

The lack of integrated campus planning has resulted in an unguided, self-driven budgeting process. In addition, categorical funding, such as VTEA, Partnership for

¹³ Triangle Associates, Inc., *Ibid.*, 10.

Excellence, Block grants and other institutional grants, is not guided by a campus strategic plan.

Self Evaluation

Planning efforts have been nonsequential and sporadic. The college has undertaken sincere planning efforts, yet these efforts have not built upon previous plans and recommendations. The limited institutional memory, as a result of administrative upheaval, has produced a planning model of constantly “reinventing the wheel.” The college needs to integrate its planning and budgeting efforts and develop a systematic process for continuous evaluation.

During the past decade, the college’s planning and evaluation efforts have been driven by outside influences, mainly the Accreditation Self-Study process. Even with outside planning efforts pressure, the college has consistently failed to carry through its planning and evaluation processes. The college must adjust and establish timelines for the continuous review and modification of its mission statement, strategic plan, and related planning and evaluation efforts.

Planning Agenda

LATTC will implement systematic and coordinated campus program and services planning efforts by creating a college strategic plan with an integrated budgeting process, and by establishing concrete timelines for the creation, assessment and review of strategic and master planning efforts and ancillary planning and evaluation processes such as program review.

C. Institutional Outcomes Assessment

C.1 The institution specifies intended institutional outcomes and has clear documentation of their achievement.

Descriptive Summary

For several years the college has operated without a strategic plan and vision with which to guide its efforts. The 1997 document, Transforming Vision into Reality, (Doc. 3.3) listed seven strategic intents for the college with an action plan for its fulfillment and corresponding outcome measurements. The plan was not implemented because of the turnover in administration. Constant presidential upheaval and impermanence have created an atmosphere of confusion and inertia in the college. Without a specific plan and administrative continuity, the college has no clear means of addressing its successes or failures.

Despite a lack of a guiding strategic plan for the campus, the college draws upon certain Generic outcomes, which are a result of internal pressures, and externally mandated

accountability. Internal outcomes include:

1. Enrollment increases and fiscal stability;
2. Student success and retention;
3. Job placement.

Externally mandated outcomes include:

1. Student Right to Know (SRTK) measures;
2. Partnership for Excellence measures.

Census enrollment for the college over the past decade experienced a downward slump, bottoming out in 1998, with a dramatic increase in the past four years. In the winter of 2002, the campus created an Enrollment Management Committee that focuses on the issues of recruitment and retention of students. A roadblock to expanding enrollment relates directly to the fiscal stability of the college.

Self Evaluation

LACCD has experienced tremendous growth in the past couple of years. The rate of growth has outpaced the rate that the State government funds growth. This has led the district to accumulate a total of 20,000 unfunded FTES in 2000-2001. This has impacted LATTC by approximately \$3 million. The district and college cannot continue expanding at its current rate without adequate funding. For the past two years the college has had a surplus, with a \$3 million surplus in 2000-2001. Due to the unfunded growth and the cuts in the state budget, the college is predicting a 2002-2003 shortfall of approximately of three million to five million for the following year, based on the PAC, April 8, 2002.¹⁴

Student success and retention figures are available on a department and course basis on the ORP website <http://www.lattc.cc.ca.us/dept/tisp/index.cfm>. Classes that are involved in the placement process through the matriculation assessment process also have their own success data. Some programs are using this information to adjust their strategies and policies. The Learning Skills Center is revamping its program to increase both student success and retention.

The college does not track job placement at this time, although this has been a prominent aspect of LATTC's mission from its inception. This information is essential for ensuring that program offerings are meeting market demands. In addition the information would be useful for program recruitment and the establishment of alumni contacts.

Planning Agenda

Future plans call for the following actions:

- The creation of a strategic plan with measurable goals and outcomes;
- The creation of measurable outcomes for the implementation of each master plan;

¹⁴ PAC Minutes, 4/8/02.

The publication of achievements on a regular basis to the campus community;
The tracking of student placement and employment.

C.2 The institution uses information from its evaluation and planning activities to communicate matters of quality assurance to the public.

Descriptive Summary

Campus and public communication has been an important issue over the past year. A Recruitment Committee was formed in fall of 2001 to examine the efforts of the High School Relations office and other programs on campus to recruit students. An initial review was made of the college's materials and a coordination of recruiting activities was started.

In the late fall of 2001, the president hired an assistant to serve as a liaison with the public and to increase the college's exposure. The assistant has established contacts with the media including the *Downtown New* and *The Los Angeles Times*, in order to increase the flow of information between the college and the news media. The college and President Castro were featured in articles in the *LA Time Magazine*, and the Los Angeles magazine.

Self Evaluation

There are two kinds of people in this world, those who have gone to Trade-Tech, and those who don't know anything about Trade-Tech.¹⁵

This statement, contained within the Triangle Associates' report, reflects the invisibility that LATTC experiences in the community. Other surrounding colleges have marketed their programs and colleges through billboards, radio and newspaper advertising. LATTC is markedly "invisible" to the public and its communities.

The college still needs to review its promotional material to ensure their currency and marketing appeal.

Despite the initial efforts of a recruitment committee to review the efforts of the High School Relations Office, and other campus programs and the hiring of a public liaison to increase the college's exposure, the college must make continued strides in reestablishing its visibility in the community. A full-time marketing director would assist the college creating visibility and marketing campus programs and services and in its recruitment of students, faculty and staff.

¹⁵ *Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Assessment Report*, Triangle Associates, Inc., January 3, 2002, 20.

Planning Agenda

It is recommended that the campus commit to successfully marketing and highlighting its programs and services to the community and to the public by exploring the following methods: 1) increasing public exposure of college achievements through the news media and advertising; and 2) hiring a full-time marketing director.

C.3 The institution systematically reviews and modifies, as appropriate, its institutional research efforts, evaluation processes, institutional plans, and planning processes to determine their ongoing utility for assessing institutional effectiveness.

Descriptive Summary

The 1997 summer planning retreats were the beginning of college efforts to establish a systematic planning and effectiveness program. A timeline was created as part of the Future Search Committee for completing the assigned tasks, as well as reviewing the process as a whole.

The program review process also established a timeline and reviewed its effectiveness at the end of its 1998-1999 cycle. The program review committee solicited comments from those departments and programs that were reviewed in the sequence. These comments were compiled into a document, *Suggestions about the Program Review Process*. Suggestions included changes in the committee makeup, as well as changes in the Key Performance Indicators, adjusting the program review timeline, acknowledging differences between vocational and non-vocational programs, and other program review process areas.

The suggestions from the program review committee were reexamined in January 2002 as the college moved forward to revitalize its program review process. It was acknowledged that the strategic intents of the prior program review process should be adapted to conform to the new mission statement. Program review committee membership was reconfigured according to suggestions from the 1998-1999 cycle.

A new timeline was created along with changes in the Key Performance Indicators and programs from Student Services and Administrative Services were added. Program Review 2002, the Office of Research and Planning, the Educational Master Plan 2003, the Facilities Master Plan, and the upcoming Technology Master Plan 2003, are all interrelated and critical in providing a basis for college planning, assessment, budgeting and resources allocation.

Self Evaluation

In 1997, the college began with a sincere effort in creating a strategic plan for the campus. Due to the lack of stable leadership there was a lack of enforcement of planning efforts created in prior administrations. The *Future Search* document was all but

forgotten by succeeding administrations. The current administration brought a sense of stability and the documents resurfaced and served as a basis for which to rebuild the college-wide planning process.

The former program review process experienced the same fate as the previous strategic planning efforts of the college. Without stable leadership, recommendations by the program review committee became papers in files and sat unused. The 2002 revitalized program review process builds upon the 1998-1999 efforts and is in its first round. This pilot group will be used to adjust the program review guidelines and resources as needed for the next groups. The revised 2002 program review is designed to review one-fifth of the programs per year, ensuring that all campus programs will be reviewed every five years.

Planning Agenda

The program review process, the Educational Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, and the Technology Master Plan, in conjunction with the Office of Research and Planning must be all be systematically reviewed and evaluated, and revised for currency and relevancy, in order to provide a continuous, valid foundation for college planning, assessment, budgeting and resource allocation.

Standard Three: Institutional Effectiveness Documents List

- 3.1 Triangle Report Transforming Vision into Reality
- 3.2 PAC Major Priorities for the Year
- 3.3 Transforming Vision into Reality