

Report to Faculty, Administrators, Trustees, Students
Of

LaGuardia Community College
Long Island City, NY

Prepared following analysis of the institution's
Periodic Review Report

First Reviewer:

Dr. Penny A. Haynes
Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs/Provost
Schenectady County Community College

Second Reviewer:

Dr. Jacqueline Kineavy
Sr. Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs
Passaic Community College

August 1, 2017

Evaluation of the Periodic Review Report of LaGuardia Community College

I. Introduction

LaGuardia Community College first opened its doors in 1974 as part of the City University of New York. LaGuardia educates more than 50,000 New Yorkers annually offering 60 Associate degree and certificate programs and continuing education programs. In 2015-2016 LaGuardia served approximately 19,500 credit students and more than 30,000 non-credit students. LaGuardia's students are largely low-income with 75% of students coming from households earning less than \$25, 00 annually. The majority of students are foreign-born. The student population comes from over 140 different countries and speak more than 95 different languages. More than one third of the students are over the age of 23.

The Periodic review report (PRR) provides readers with an overview of the institutional progress since the College's last decennial self-study and team visit. The PRR has documented how the recommendations of the self-study and the evaluators' recommendations have been addressed. The report demonstrates a commitment to widespread college involvement in its preparation and it demonstrates a clear commitment to progress that has taken place at the institution since the team visit. The college has been involved in a number of initiatives and grants that have helped them to address the recommendations in the report specifically focusing on student success. The institution is to be commended for the process of responding to recommendations.

The report did present some challenges for the readers and, while most responses to the recommendations were thorough, it appeared that there was much less focus on evaluators' recommendations than on their own self-study recommendations. The appendices were difficult to navigate and because of the appendices, the document was over 500 pages.

II. Responses to Recommendations from the Previous Decennial Evaluation

This section summarizes the College's responses to the recommendations made in the decennial report. LaGuardia provided a number of internal recommendations in their self-study and have responded to them. In addition, the evaluators' recommendations focusing on advising (8 and 9), online education (standard 13), and assessment (Standards 7, 11, 12, 14) were addressed as well.

Standard I.

Recommendation #1.1: The College should implement its plans for disseminating the Mission and Goals throughout the campus.

This was an internal recommendation that has been addressed. LaGuardia cited several examples in the document and in the appendices.

Recommendation #1.2: When developing goals for annual college targets in the Strategic Plan, divisions and departments should demonstrate how their initiatives support the College's mission.

Again, this was an internal recommendation that LaGuardia feels has been addressed by incorporating the Mission Statement in the Strategic Plan template.

Standards 2, 3, 7

The recommendations from Standards 2 and 3 came from LaGuardia's internal recommendations. LaGuardia has put significant emphasis on these recommendations and appears to have fully addressed them.

Recommendation #2.1: The College should report each year if a strategic plan target has been met and targets should remain on the strategic plan until met.

The College has addressed this recommendation and has an established process whereby unmet goals will remain until they are met. They have provided examples from their outcomes report in attached appendices which sufficiently demonstrates their commitment to this goal.

Recommendation #2.2: The College should consider enhancing stakeholder input into the budget development process by providing the College community with an opportunity to comment on the Executive Council's proposals for prioritizing strategic plan initiatives before the funding decisions are finalized.

While it appears that the process has consistently followed a standard governance procedure, LaGuardia went further to enhance stakeholder input into the budget development and funding process. In 2016, the College established a Budget Advisory Committee. Comprised of five elected members from the College Senate (two students, one faculty, and two staff members), a College Administrator and a senior faculty member, the committee meets at least three times a year to review LaGuardia's operating budget and the allocation of resources, prior to final funding decisions. The College Community is fully able to participate in the planning process.

LAGCC Recommendation #3.3: The College should devise a succession plan that takes into account the larger number of faculty and staff eligible for retirement in the coming decade.

In response to this recommendation LaGuardia has focused more on professional development for its faculty and staff, and, like most colleges finds that predicting retirement of faculty is challenging. The professional development is an effective approach to this concern.

LAGCC Recommendation #3.4: College should assess the classroom allocation process and explore ways to ensure that faculty understands the process

LAGCC Recommendation #3.5: The College should develop a more formal technology planning process that allows regular input from stakeholders on the priorities that the College has developed for the upgrading of all aspects of its technology interfaces and infrastructure.

LAGCC Recommendation #3.6: The current uncoordinated system for the acquisition of faculty and staff computers should be assessed to determine if it meets the needs of the faculty and staff.

Responses to 3.4-3.6 are similar in nature and the readers' summary follows. The College has improved the classroom allocation procedure through the use of software and has made the process transparent. Classroom utilization was examined, classroom capacities recorded, and a series of review is now a part of the procedure. The college community appears to be well-informed and satisfied with this process. Regarding technology and upgrades, much of the process is in collaboration with CUNY; however LaGuardia has ensured that the process is well communicated and that numerous parties are aware of the procedures. The College is regularly informed in a timely manner by the needs of individual users. The ongoing investments in technology hardware and software is guided by individual technology users, with patterns of need identified, and support delivered to advance the best interests of the college community at large. Analyses of data, including help and purchase requests and usage patterns, by the Division of Information Technology is used to identify technology needs and to make calculated decisions regarding technology investments. In addition, faculty and academic department councils regularly communicate their requirements directly to the Provost and senior leadership in the Division of Academic Affairs. Further research on the process of faculty and staff computers indicated that the college does have a cyclical process and the actual replacement cycle was more of an inconvenience to faculty at the time of the self-study. Faculty and staff indicated a preference for replacement upon demand. The college has addressed this issue sufficiently.

Standard 7 Institutional Effectiveness

Standard 7 saw three internal recommendations and the evaluators' summative recommendation as follows:

Recommendation #7.7: The College should regularly assess the effectiveness of

institutional resource allocation, including the budget process itself, to ensure that it is aligned with strategic objectives and initiatives

LAGCC Recommendation #7.8: The College should encourage all areas to file formal assessment designs and assessment results with IR&A. IR&A should maintain a centralized assessment library on SharePoint and periodically update the College community on recent assessments.

LAGCC Recommendation #7.9: Each Vice President should file an audit of assessment activities in his or her division each year with the President, providing the President with an overview of all assessment activities at the College. IR&A should provide an annual agenda of key assessment activities at the College to permit broad involvement in the design of the research and dissemination of the findings.

Evaluators Recommendation:

The College should develop an overall assessment strategy to provide a framework that emphasizes opportunities for cross-campus sharing of assessment activities and findings in order to encourage collaboration and to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of assessment activities.

The College was able to provide evidence at the time of their self-study of institutional assessment taking place. The recommendations, as summarized by the visiting team, focused more on a process that would allow sharing of findings and opportunities for collaboration and improvement of the assessment activities. The College has developed a process that satisfies this recommendation. In addition to the office of Institutional Research providing timely information, referred to as their six-point submission, which provides information on who is doing assessment, what assessment is taking place, and when the assessment is taking place, the assessment activities are also filed by each Vice-President, with the President, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, as well as making it available on a SharePoint library. This provides for an overview of all assessment activities at the College and serves as a cross-campus assessment resource. Last, to facilitate the cross campus sharing and discussion of assessment methods and activities, forums used include the President's Cabinet, as well as Professional Staff, and Instructional Staff meetings. While allowing for an increase in transparency and accountability for divisional initiatives, the process has been part of an exploratory effort to understand the benefits of both inter and intra-divisional assessments. Examples have been appropriately provided.

Standards 4, 5, 6 Leadership, Governance, Administration, and Integrity

The recommendations from this area were specific internal recommendations regarding the processes and transparency of leadership, governance, and administration.

LAGCC Recommendation #4.1: The College should define a periodic review process for college governance that includes a timetable and desired outcomes of governance

LAGCC Recommendation #4.2: The College should develop a formal orientation program for new College Senators.

LAGCC Recommendation #6.3: The College Senate should post minutes of its meetings

All of these issues were addressed by committee review of governance. The college has included a process to review and assess governance, they have instituted an orientation meeting for College Senators that occurs directly prior to the first Senate meeting, and they now post minutes of meetings within three business days of approval.

Chapter 3, LAGCC Recommendation #5.4: The College should establish a formal charter and guidelines for the Executive Council.

This has been completed and publicized.

Chapter 3, LAGCC Recommendation #5.5: The Executive Council should develop a process to assess its effectiveness as a team.

The Council completed a self-assessment in late June 2016. Although it doesn't appear that they have committed to a specific process going forward.

Suggestion: If assessing the effectiveness of the Executive Council remains a priority, the College should develop guidelines and a timetable for how they will continue to access this process.

Chapter 3, LAGCC Recommendation #6.6: The College should assess the effectiveness of communications on the competitiveness of entry to clinical programs and strive to improve applicant understanding.

The College has taken numerous steps to achieve this goal including information sessions, addressing the topic in First Year Seminar, and group advising. The college made this a priority and has made significant strides in improving applicant understanding. They were able to provide some early assessment data indicating significantly less candidates applying who were unable to gain access.

Chapter 3, LAGCC Recommendation #6.7: The College should set standards for the information to be made available online on academic programs to include graduation, retention, transfer, employment, and graduate licensing rates.

To the extent possible, LaGuardia has made strides on this goal and has been able to post additional information regarding licensure and other available

information. The data regarding employment is not readily available; however, the College continues to make efforts to improve program information

Standards 8, 9

One of the major areas where LaGuardia has made significant strides is in the area of Admissions, Retention, and student support. The following recommendations have been addressed:

Chapter 4, LAGCC Recommendation #8.1: New Allied Health majors should be mandated to register for an Allied Health section of First Year Seminar in order to obtain essential information about the programs, including requirements and career options.

Completed.

Chapter 4, LAGCC Recommendation #8.2: The College should assess the effect of its Ability to Benefit (ATB) preparatory workshops on the pass rate of student taking (or re-taking) the ATB test.

This was examined for one cycle; however, small numbers limited the reliability and because of the limited numbers and financial constraints the college has not considered this to be an ongoing priority.

The following recommendations around advising are a combination of internal and evaluator recommendations

Chapter 4, LAGCC Recommendation #9.3: Gaps in advising continue to exist because of the decentralization of advising services. A study of these issues has been undertaken by Achieving the Dream and the recommendations from that committee should be implemented.

Chapter 4, Evaluators' Recommendation for Standard 8: The College should examine the alignment of advising across units so as to ensure a seamless transition for students and effectively address retention issues. This alignment will ensure that all cohorts of students are attended to and the advising responsibilities are clearly delineated across the College.

Chapter 4, Evaluators' Recommendations for Standard 9a: The College should implement improvements to procedures and processes of the advising system in order to support students throughout their academic career at the College and to insure alignment across Academic and Student Affairs.

The College is to be commended for their response to this series of recommendations. They have set goals through their Achieving the Dream initiative and have followed through on all of them. The College restructured the advising process, moved to a Provost model, and integrated Academic and Student Affairs by changing the reporting structure in an attempt to break down silos. They developed advising teams, integrated plans in the first year

experience class and have developed specific steps in advising for a student for their entire time at LaGuardia. The College has invested in a professional evaluator (Dr. Ashley Finley) to examine their processes and has had significant positive changes in the advising process. The college has devised advising for specific cohort populations and has focused on wellness and the entire student experience. LaGuardia has also used tools to assess the perception of advising using two survey instruments with both indicating percentage increases in the satisfaction of advising services.

Suggestion: The College should develop a plan to assess the effectiveness of the integration of Academic and Student Affairs.

Chapter 4, LAGCC Recommendation #9.4: The College should create a position and/or office whose sole responsibility is to supervise, manage, coordinate, and assess all retention initiatives at the College.

Chapter 4, LAGCC Recommendation #9.5: The College should develop and mandate a comprehensive assessment methodology that can be used across all retention programs and initiatives.

The College did not implement the position recommended because they recognized that it would not be effective and may only encourage a lack of collaboration between units. They did work closely with Institutional Research to focus on retention across the campus. The Institutional Research division calculates, based on a formula, how many students should be retained based on the population cohorts and focuses on interventions to the population. This is an ongoing process that the college is managing effectively.

Chapter 4, Evaluators' Recommendation for Standard 9b: The College needs to ensure that all electronic and print media and communications meet the standards established by the Americans with Disabilities Act Standards for Accessible Design (2010).

As a result of this recommendation the college developed an ADA workgroup and has implemented changes to ensure that the college is meeting the standards. The group continues to examine methods for continual improvement and provided specific examples in the PRR.

Standard 10: Faculty

Chapter 5, Recommendation #10.1: The College should support the faculty's ability to participate fully in service, scholarship, and professional development programs by encouraging and supporting, wherever possible, that these activities come with reassigned time for full-time faculty and funding for part-time faculty.

There has been some movement in this area and some additional funding; however, this continues to be a concern for faculty and LaGuardia continues to consider additional opportunities for improvement.

Chapter 5, Recommendation #10.2: The College should reconsider the student instructional reports (SIRs) and investigate alternative methods of student evaluation of teaching, and, if a preferable alternative is found, implement a change to this alternative.

The College did research alternative methods, but found that there were numerous issues and the SIRs remain the evaluation method which was determined after the research. Steps were taken to address the evaluation process which may prove more effective.

Chapter 5, LAGCC Recommendation #10.3: The College should develop a more efficient procedure for gathering accurate information about faculty professional activity, and it should improve communication with faculty so they understand the importance of reporting this activity to CUNY.

The new online SharePoint database provides one location for the reporting of scholarly work completed during the previous calendar year eliminating previously duplicative reporting requirements. The new database fulfills three functions for the College which includes, meeting CUNY's Performance Management Process reporting mandate of faculty professional activities, providing an organized and consistent method for compiling a list of honorees for the President's Annual Celebration of Faculty & Staff Scholarship, and providing a means of collecting this information, with standardized metadata fields, for publication in the annual Faculty & Staff Notes newsletter.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Chapter 6, LAGCC Recommendation #11.1: The College should systematically collect and use information on the success of its transfer students and working graduates to improve curriculum and future employment prospects for its current students.

Complete

Chapter 6, LAGCC Recommendation #11.2: The College should strive to address the funding and staffing issues affecting the efforts of the tutorial programs and the Library to better serve our students. In particular, the College should explore ways of ensuring that the implementation of new programs is accompanied by budget allocations to fund library resources recommended to support the program.

The College has increased its Librarian FTEs, has increased funds to the Library and expanded resources to support programs.

Suggestion: The College should consider more online (OER) options for the Library as a means to reduce costs.

Chapter 6, LAGCC Recommendation #11. 3: New course and program proposals and proposals for revisions should require a short reflection on how the proposed effort is aligned with the College mission.

Implemented.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Chapter 7, LAGCC Recommendation #13.1: Basic Skills: In order to facilitate enrollment in ESL Learning Communities, the College should provide targeted advisement for ESL student who have declared specific majors.

NA as learning communities no longer exist; however, the college does provide specific ESL advising days.

Chapter 7, LAGCC Recommendation #13.2: The ACE Curriculum Committee should add a preamble or more explicit mission-related criteria to its application documentation for new courses.

Implemented.

Chapter 7, LAGCC Recommendation #13.3: The College should establish periodic assessment procedures for certificate program student support services.

Assessments are being utilized as part of the program completions.

Chapter 7, Evaluators' Recommendation for Standard 13: In the online program, the College should institute uniform and consistent course design practices, implement effective support services aimed at student success in online courses, and implement assessment methodology.

The College has worked diligently in this area, specifically related to course design and quality. Various working groups were formed and discussions to create more uniform practices were held. The tools and methodologies used to facilitate standardization are the Quality Matters Rubric; peer-to-peer collaboration and sharing; peer feedback; and more recently, the Assignment Charrette process. The Assignment Design Charrette is a significant element in this design approach; it is a proven faculty engagement process developed by Pat Hutchings of the Carnegie Foundation and the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Development. Various technology tools are introduced for facilitating course management. While all of the efforts under this recommendation fall

under course design and management which clearly will enhance the student experience, it is unclear if tools are in place for student support in the online program.

Recommendation: The College should ensure effective support services aimed at student success are available in online programs.

Standard 12 and 14: Assessment of Student Learning and General Education

LaGuardia has done significant work in the area of assessment surrounding program review schedules, updating outcomes and curriculum mapping. There has been a focus on General Education and on developing assessment tools and rubrics which are very positive. It remains unclear, as little evidence was provided, that a cycle of general education assessment has occurred and what, if any, analysis has taken place as a result of general education assessment. The readers' comments on each recommendation follow:

Chapter 8: Evaluators' Recommendation 12a: The College should review and account more clearly for how the College's general education program, as it is currently designed, approximates the minimum content requirement of 15 credit hours of an associate's degree.

The College follows CUNY's Pathways which incorporate core competencies and they have provided much information on the process to incorporate the Pathways; however, it appears that the general education requirements and how they will be met in all programs is not entirely complete. It is not clear to the readers that there is a consistent assessment cycle of general education or that general education has been identified for all programs. The work surrounding integration of the Pathways is significant, and the work to respond to this recommendation in identifying the credit hours and the competencies was addressed, but minimal results were provided that could indicate a consistent and sustained process of general education assessment.

Recommendation: The College should demonstrate that assessment of general education is occurring systematically and that results are being used to improve student learning.

Chapter 8, LAGCC Recommendation #12.1: Institute a faculty process to regularly review and update the College's core competencies to better reflect changing standards in higher education.

Chapter 8, Evaluators' Recommendation 12b: The College should ensure that student learning of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives, and of the competency of technological literacy, is accounted for and included in each student's general education program.

The college has sufficiently addressed this recommendation as indicated in the PRR. They have spent significant time in reviewing Core Competencies and developing a methodology for assessment. The above competencies are reflected in the Core and have been identified by the College.

Chapter 8, Evaluators' Recommendation #14b The College should update all curriculum information related to assessment, including all program outcomes, course learning outcomes, and curriculum maps.

Curriculums are updated to include program outcomes and learning outcomes. The mapping, as stated in the PRR, is a work in progress as the core competencies are still being identified and mapped.

Recommendation: The College must update all program curriculum maps to include the core competencies in each program and ensure that the programs and core competencies are assessed.

Recommendation: The College should continue to implement a plan to ensure that pass rates in the Dietetic Technician Program continue to rise.

Chapter 8, LAGCC Recommendation #14.2: Pilot ePortfolio assessment using the entire ePortfolio rather than individual pieces on a student's ePortfolio.

Complete

Chapter 8, LAGCC Recommendation 14.3: Reinforce the beginning point for collecting entry-level data in the ePortfolio assessment database. While the College has done significant work over the past five years with capstone and advanced level ePortfolios, the beginning point of ePortfolios (in First Year Academies) has not continued as a robust collection site. The College needs to return its attention to the first year and the vital role it plays in collecting a baseline for student work to be assessed.

This has been adequately addressed. LaGuardia is to be commended for a quality ePortfolio program.

Chapter 8, LAGCC Recommendation #14.4: Programs should continue their efforts regarding the assessment of programmatic competencies.

Chapter 8, LAGCC Recommendation #14.5: Strengthen faculty's ability to work with data.

Chapter 8, Evaluator's Recommendation #14c: The College should ensure that all PPR projects occur on LaGuardia's established cycle, and that general education competencies continue to be assessed on an institutionally established schedule.

LaGuardia has provided evidence that program reviews are on an established schedule and that the program reviews are yielding recommendations that are being addressed. The college provided examples of two program reviews and

identified changes that were being made as a result. The College also provided a table to identify a timeline for the program review process. It still remains unclear if the college is assessing general education competencies on an institutionally established schedule. The recommendations were made above in response to General Education.

III. Major Challenges and/or Opportunities

The College has identified its continuing challenges and opportunities over the next five years. LaGuardia's work around student success and implementation of the Core General Education competencies continue to be focus areas. Specifically the College finds opportunities in the new degree program offerings and in additional program options. These additions are in several different areas. They also have identified opportunities in implementing Core competencies that was discussed earlier in this report. The Pathways process was a campus-wide project, and, as a result, the College indicates a deepening in the focus on student learning. Additionally, the College indicates that they are developing general education requirements in their CUNY Pathways project. When this is fully developed, the College will need to ensure that the General Education program is assessed on a regular basis and is used to improve student learning. Additional opportunities have come in the form of enrollment increases, though the College also identifies a potential challenge relating to enrollment in potentially stricter immigration laws that may affect their student enrollment in the future.

As enrollment growth occurred, so too, did faculty and staff growth. LaGuardia notes the credentials of their faculty with 58% of full-time faculty holding Ph.Ds. The College is committed to working with Achieving the Dream to continue to implement and improve in areas of advising, orientation and First Year Seminar (FYS). FYS results are impressive with 7,000 students enrolling with data indicating improved outcomes.

The College has also implemented a new CUNYfirst student data system which will allow them to manage student, faculty and staff records more efficiently. In addition, LaGuardia has been successful in obtaining external resources through grant funding including \$2.9 million from the First in the World grant, \$2.6 million for a Title V grant, and a \$4.0 million grant from the US Department of Education for funding for STEM CONNECT. In addition, LaGuardia received increased foundation support up to \$3 million.

Challenges for LaGuardia include concerns around government funding. While funding has remained relatively stable, it is often unpredictable. Enrollment has been able to support funding but with the high school populations attending college expected to shrink, the College is concerned. As with most colleges, space can be problematic, and while the College has a process for space allocation, the physical limitations and cost constraints are of concern.

Suggestion: the College should develop a plan for future space considerations to include physical space and a budget.

The College has indicated that, although they addressed their recommendations around faculty support for professional development, it continues to be a faculty concern and the college will need to continue to improve in this area with the faculty and they have indicated that this remains an ongoing focus area.

IV. Enrollment and Finance Trends

LaGuardia has taken a serious look at enrollment and has made projections of enrollment declines based on factors to include high school declines, and potential impacts of immigration policies. They have placed a major focus on student retention as well as the effectiveness of their recruitment strategies which now includes pre-admissions programs where the college has seen early success. The corresponding budget has been based on conservative estimates of governmental funding which remain uncertain, potentials for increased tuition which is dependent upon CUNY approval, and the possibility of an overall political shift in the approach to higher education. Overall, the College has done an excellent job of examining all of the potential factors and developing a conservative budget and enrollment projection.

V. Assessment Process and Plans

LaGuardia was commended in the self-study for having a culture of assessment and overall the College has remained focused on assessment. Most areas of the College have been participating in some form of assessment and, the College has identified both positive and negative aspects of the process. The ability to self-reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment process suggest the strong culture remains. The College appears committed to build on the process and has indicated some plans for changing some areas. As mentioned in the earlier section addressing the recommendations, it appears that the College does have plans for incorporating specific general education in their Pathways project but will need to demonstrate the process is part of the assessment plan to improve student learning.

LaGuardia has ensured that their expected outcomes and goals are identified within their programs and will need to develop a similar process throughout the college. As mentioned in their narrative, some offices are identifying an area that needs to be fixed as opposed to a sustained process of assessment; however, the college appears to be moving toward “focused assessment methodology.”

Suggestion: The College should develop an implementation plan to ensure all areas of the College are utilizing a “focused assessment methodology.”

VI. Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting Process

The College has a clear process of institutional planning and the budgeting process. The strategic plan establishes the core objectives for the College. The strategic initiatives guide the development of specific areas initiatives, which, in turn, drive the budget requests and the overall budgeting process. The linkage is evident. The Vice President of Administration works with the Budget Advisory committee and proposals are approved or denied based on specific strategic alignment and funding availability. The College has been successful in funding several large projects as a result of this ongoing process. The College has also integrated the grant and contract development process into the overall budget development process and makes adjustments annually.

VII. Conclusion

LaGuardia has responded favorably to recommendations set forth in the decennial report and has made progress where needed. The College is clearly an innovative institution with a number of initiatives aimed at improvement. The College utilized the self-study to make numerous internal recommendations which likely would not have risen to the evaluators' level; however, they took these recommendations seriously and addressed each one. The College has been involved in a CUNY Pathways project which has allowed them to integrate competencies into programs in an overall effort to improve CUNY wide transferability. This process seems to have brought a large group of faculty together to concentrate on this project, and ultimately this will improve their programs. It may have also put them a step back in fully completing a cycle of general education assessment.

The readers have made the following suggestions and recommendations as a result of the Periodic review report:

Suggestion: If assessing the effectiveness of the Executive Council remains a priority, the College should develop guidelines and a timetable for how they will continue to access this process.

Suggestion: The College should develop a plan to assess the effectiveness of the integration of Academic and Student Affairs.

Suggestion: The College should consider more online (OER) options for the Library as a means to reduce costs.

Suggestion: the College should develop a plan for future space considerations to include physical space and a budget.

Suggestion: The College should develop an implementation plan to ensure all areas of the College are utilizing a "focused assessment methodology."

Recommendation: The College should ensure effective support services aimed at student success are available in online programs.

Recommendation: The College should demonstrate that assessment of general education is occurring systematically and that results are being used to improve student learning.

Recommendation: The College must update all program curriculum maps to include the core competencies in each program and ensure that the programs and core competencies are assessed.

Recommendation: The College should continue to implement a plan to ensure that pass rates in the Dietetic Technician Program continue to rise.