Las Positas College
Accreditation Follow-up Survey: Faculty/Classified Staff/Administrators
Spring 2009

Percentage Distribution of All Survey Items, by Standard
Based on the responses of 79 faculty, classified staff and administrators

Survey Sections	Percentage who Strongly agree or Agree	Percentage of those responding					Responses to each question		Margin of Error
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Dis-Agree	Strongly Dis-Agree	N	Pct. of 79	
STANDARD 1A: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION									
The Mission Statement is central to institutional planning and decision-making	**70%**	17%	54%	15%	6%	8%	71	90%	14%
The planning process at LPC adequately identifies college priorities	**48%**	8%	39%	20%	21%	11%	71	90%	15%
LPC uses the results of the master planning process to prioritize the allocation of resources	**49%**	10%	39%	28%	13%	9%	67	85%	16%
STANDARD 1B: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING									
The results of SLO assessment are used in budget and planning at the course level	**26%**	2%	24%	28%	28%	19%	54	68%	16%
The results of SLO assessment are used in budget and planning at the Major/ Certificate (Program) level	**20%**	2%	18%	31%	29%	20%	49	62%	15%
The results of SLO assessment are used in budget and planning at the degree level	**16%**	0%	16%	34%	28%	22%	50	63%	14%
LPC organizes key processes to support student learning	**59%**	11%	47%	21%	11%	9%	70	89%	15%
LPC allocates resources to support student learning	**67%**	18%	49%	16%	11%	7%	76	96%	14%
LPC uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes	**40%**	7%	33%	31%	15%	14%	72	91%	15%
LPC uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to improve student learning	**57%**	14%	43%	19%	16%	9%	70	89%	15%
LPC employees understand institutional goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement	**49%**	10%	39%	22%	21%	8%	72	91%	15%
LPC's planning process offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies	**61%**	13%	47%	14%	18%	7%	76	96%	15%
There are clear links between planning, resource allocation, and institutional evaluation	**36%**	7%	28%	27%	24%	13%	67	85%	15%
LPC tracks progress being made on plans and evaluates its performance regularly	**41%**	6%	34%	27%	22%	11%	64	81%	16%
LPC systematically dialogues, reviews and modifies, as appropriate, all parts of the planning cycle, including institutional and other research efforts	**51%**	6%	45%	18%	18%	13%	67	85%	16%
Faculty are provided with adequate opportunity to participate in the budget process	**39%**	6%	33%	27%	20%	14%	64	81%	16%
Classified staff are provided with adequate opportunity to participate in the budget process	**31%**	6%	25%	40%	13%	17%	48	61%	17%
The college (or segments of the college) engages in inclusive, informed, and intentional dialogue about the effectiveness of our processes and policies	**53%**	7%	47%	15%	21%	11%	75	95%	15%
Changes to institutional processes and policies are guided by dialogue	**44%**	6%	38%	34%	15%	7%	71	90%	15%

Survey Sections	Percentage who	Percentage of those responding					Responses to each question		Margin of Error
	Strongly agree or Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Dis-Agree	Strongly Dis-Agree	N	Pct. of 79	
STANDARD 2A: LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS									
Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes	**60%**	10%	49%	21%	10%	9%	67	85%	16%
STANDARD 2B: LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES: SUPPORT SERVICES									
The current student services program review process is an effective method for determining appropriate improvements	**40%**	5%	36%	31%	17%	12%	42	53%	20%
STANDARD 3A: HUMAN SERVICES									
Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning	**18%**	2%	16%	22%	38%	22%	55	70%	14%
STANDARD 3B: PHYSICAL RESOURCES									
Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning	**46%**	13%	33%	24%	21%	10%	63	80%	16%
STANDARD 3D: FINANCIAL RESOURCES									
Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning	**47%**	6%	41%	24%	17%	12%	66	84%	16%
Institutional guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development are clearly defined	**29%**	6%	24%	32%	22%	16%	68	86%	14%
Institutional guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development are followed	**37%**	10%	27%	43%	10%	10%	51	65%	18%
Financial planning supports institutional goals and is linked to other institutional planning efforts	**45%**	7%	38%	30%	13%	12%	60	76%	17%
Annual and long-range financial planning reflects realistic assessments of resource availability and expenditure requirements	**38%**	6%	32%	25%	25%	11%	63	80%	16%
College administration efficiently manages financial resources and implements budget expenditures based on institutional priorities	**48%**	11%	37%	24%	21%	8%	63	80%	16%
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES									
Course level SLO's are effectively communicated to students	**37%**	8%	28%	25%	32%	7%	60	76%	16%
Course level SLO's understood by faculty	**64%**	12%	52%	13%	21%	1%	67	85%	15%
Program level SLO's (learning outcomes specific to a major) are effectively communicated to students	**19%**	5%	14%	36%	34%	12%	59	75%	13%
Program level SLO's (learning outcomes specific to a major) are understood by faculty	**39%**	7%	31%	31%	21%	9%	67	85%	15%
Student Services SLO's are effectively communicated to students	**16%**	3%	13%	50%	18%	16%	38	48%	15%
Student Services SLO's are understood by faculty	**29%**	4%	24%	31%	22%	18%	45	57%	18%
Degree Level SLO's (Core Competencies) are effectively communicated to students	**21%**	4%	17%	38%	23%	19%	53	67%	15%
Degree Level SLO's (Core Competencies) are understood by faculty	**40%**	3%	37%	23%	23%	13%	60	76%	16%
Assessment of SLO's are in place for courses	**67%**	15%	52%	16%	10%	7%	61	77%	16%
Assessment of SLO's are in place for programs/majors	**40%**	7%	33%	29%	20%	11%	55	70%	17%
Assessment of SLO's are in place for student services	**43%**	11%	32%	43%	5%	8%	37	47%	21%
Assessment of SLO are in place for the Degree level (Core Competencies)	**43%**	10%	33%	33%	14%	10%	42	53%	20%
Results of SLO assessment are used to improve learning at the course level	**54%**	4%	50%	30%	10%	6%	50	63%	18%

Survey Sections	Percentage who Strongly agree or Agree	Percentage of those responding					Responses to each question		Margin of Error
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Dis-Agree	Strongly Dis-Agree	N	Pct. of 79	
Results of SLO assessment are used to improve learning at the program/major level	**36%**	2%	33%	29%	24%	12%	42	53%	19%
Results of SLO assessment are used to improve student services	**45%**	0%	45%	39%	13%	3%	31	39%	23%
Results of SLO assessment are used to improve Degrees (A.A./A.S.)	**32%**	3%	30%	49%	14%	5%	37	47%	20%
Course SLO's are aligned with degree SLO's	**40%**	6%	33%	42%	8%	10%	48	61%	18%
Appropriate resources are in place to support assessment of SLO's	**42%**	8%	34%	18%	18%	23%	62	78%	16%
There is wide-spread institutional dialogue about the results of SLO assessment	**38%**	5%	33%	18%	26%	18%	66	84%	16%
Organizational structures are evaluated using SLO Assessment results to support student learning	**27%**	4%	23%	32%	18%	23%	56	71%	15%
PROGRAM REVIEW: INSTRUCTIONAL									
PR is ongoing, systematic, and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement	**61%**	6%	55%	18%	6%	15%	33	42%	22%
Programs dialogue about the results of PR as part of discussion of program effectiveness	**47%**	9%	38%	24%	18%	12%	34	43%	22%
Dialogue about the results of all PR is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness	**48%**	6%	42%	13%	23%	16%	31	39%	24%
Results of PR are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making	**48%**	6%	42%	16%	6%	29%	31	39%	24%
Results of PR are linked to planning and resources allocation for program improvement	**48%**	12%	36%	15%	6%	30%	33	42%	23%
Results of PR are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resources allocation process	**34%**	9%	25%	22%	13%	31%	32	41%	22%
LPC evaluates how effective the PR process is in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes	**50%**	14%	36%	7%	11%	32%	28	35%	25%
PROGRAM REVIEW: STUDENT SERVICES									
PR is ongoing, systematic, and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement	**83%**	33%	50%	0%	0%	17%	6	8%	43%
Programs dialogue about the results of PR as part of discussion of program effectiveness	**67%**	17%	50%	17%	0%	17%	6	8%	54%
Dialogue about the results of all PR is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness	**40%**	0%	40%	40%	0%	20%	5	6%	63%
Results of PR are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making	**67%**	17%	50%	17%	0%	17%	6	8%	54%
Results of PR are linked to planning and resources allocation for program improvement	**50%**	17%	33%	33%	0%	17%	6	8%	58%
Results of PR are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resources allocation process	**50%**	17%	33%	33%	0%	17%	6	8%	58%
LPC evaluates how effective the PR process is in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes	**83%**	0%	83%	0%	0%	17%	6	8%	43%