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REPORT PREPARATION

West Los Angeles College’s established shared governance system provided the structure for the production of this report between early July, 2012, when the Commission’s letter reached the campus, and late February, 2013, when the report went to press. A standing committee of the College Council, the Accreditation Steering Committee, had overseen the production of the 2012 Self-Study; it continued with the follow-up report. The College Council asked existing committees to take responsibility for various recommendations:


The Planning and Program Review Committees (combined in September into the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, a standing committee of the College Council) worked on Recommendations 1, 2, and 7, with assistance from the Budget Committee, the Technology Committee, and the Facilities Committee.

A standing committee of the Academic Senate, the SLO Committee, took the lead on recommendations 3 and 4.

These bodies formed working groups to address particular elements of the recommendation, or assigned them to existing sub-committees and task forces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurable Goals in Technology Master Plan</td>
<td>Technology Committee TMP evaluation workgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable Goals in Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>Facilities Committee workgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs and SAOs</td>
<td>SLO Committee workgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Governance Participation</td>
<td>College Council workgroup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Dean in the Office of Instruction was charged with recommendation 5.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Chair of the Library Division, and a Dean in the Office of Instruction worked on recommendation 6. They set up a working group consisting of the faculty librarians.

The Vice President of Student Services took the lead on recommendation 6 of 2006.

District personnel prepared the responses to the district recommendations with the help of faculty and administrators from across the district.

A corrective action matrix developed by the District Office of Institutional Effectiveness had been used to track issues raised in previous accreditation cycles. The Steering Committee augmented it with clarifications of how the college understood the recommendations. The committees and workgroups updated the matrix with progress made in meeting the recommendations monthly, and more often as needed.
The Faculty Co-Chair of the Accreditation Steering Committee became a division chair and the college replaced her in a search process following established procedures. The new chair took over in early September. By October, she began to draft responses using the data gathered in the corrective action matrices. Complete drafts were posted on the college website in late November, early December, January 17, February 14, and February 20. The college employed a consultant who read several drafts and made suggestions to improve clarity and responsiveness.

As the venue uniting all constituency groups, the College Council received reports on the production of the report at its monthly meetings. Representatives at College Council have the obligation to relay information to their constituencies. The Faculty Co-Chair presented updates to other groups as they requested them, including at monthly meetings of the Academic Senate, and some meetings of the Divisional Council (academic chairs), the Student Services Council (student services administrators, faculty and staff), and the Faculty Guild. The Academic Senate voted to approve the report at its meeting February 26, 2013.

The Board of Trustee’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee received reports on West Los Angeles College’s plans to meet the recommendations at its October 1, 2012 meeting, and reviewed the draft report at its February 20, 2013 meeting. The full Board of Trustees received the report at the March 6, 2012 meeting.

West Los Angeles College thanks all the members of the college and district community who contributed to the production of this report. A necessarily partial list, arranged by committee, includes:

**The College Council:**
Fran Leonard, Adrienne Foster, Judy Chow, Laura Petersen, Helen Young, Kevin Considine, Betsy Regalado, Bob Sprague, Ken Takeda, Joann Haywood, Sheila Jeter-Williams, Richard Olivas, Olga Shewfelt, Bonnie Blustein, Gabriel Brown, Abel Rodriguez, Rebecca Tillberg, Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh, Zulma Mena, Shalamon Duke, Allan Hansen

**The Divisional Council** (omitting those already named):
Abraha Bahta, Anna Chiang, Luis Cordova, Carmen Dones, Lartee Harris, Sherron Rouzan, Buck Stapleton, Joyce Sweeney, Michael Arata, Jane Witucki, Mary-Jo Apigo, Aracely Aguiar, Judith Ann Friedman, Kathy Walton, Judith Fierro, Mark Pracher

**The Academic Senate** (omitting those already named):
Clare Norris, Ken Lin, Jack Moy, Kenneth Taira, Jawell Samilton, Holly Bailey-Hofmann, Kenyatta Bakeer, Sue de Bord, William Bucher, Melinda Smith, Yvonne Simone, Norma Barragan, Katherine Boutry

**AFT Faculty Guild** (omitting those already named):
Bruce Anders, Grace Chee, Lucy Blake Elahi, Faz Elahi, Evelyn Liskin, Jack Ruebensaal

**Student Services Council** (omitting those already named):
Patty Banday, Michael Golterman, Celena Alcala, Steve Aggers, Maria Mancia, Glenn Schenk, Kathleen Greer, Angel Viramontes

**SLO Committee** (omitting those already named):
Todd Matosic, Farah Esmaeili, Hansel Tsai
The Budget Committee (omitting those already named):
Ashanti Lyles, Eric Ichon, Karina Weatherly, Maureen O’Brien, Dionne Morrissette
The Leadership Retreat Committee and staff (omitting those already named):
Michelle Long-Coffee, Clarissa Castellanos, Vicky Nesia, Claudia Velasco, Florence Shamo, Pornpimol Hayward
The Technology Committee (omitting those already named):
Vidya Swaminathan, Marcus Butler, Josefin Calton, Nick Dang, Helen Lin, Manish Patel, Jan Pfeiffer, Leo Calderon, Jason Irish
The FPIP Committee (omitting those already named):
Lisa Kamibayashi, Norma Jacinto, Mesfin Alemayehu
The Facilities Committee (omitting those already named): Karen Burzynski; Jeffery Lee
The PIE Committee (omitting those already named): Cristi Lizaes; Aimee Preziosi, Marlene Shepherd, Agyeman Boateng
The District Institutional Effectiveness Committee: Mona Field, Kelly Candaele, Nancy Pearlman, Daniel LaVista; Yasmin Delahoussaye

Kristina Thomas, Vicky Nesia, Maria Pineda, Albert Williams, Clarissa Castellanos and Michelle Long-Coffee provided invaluable formatting, web and printing assistance.

Matthew C. Lee and Deborah Kaye advised on the form of the report.

---
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RECOMMENDATION 1 – Measurable Goal Setting (2012)

In order to fully meet the Standard, the college must specify its goals on all its master plans and its annual plans in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be assessed, discussed, and applied to decisions regarding improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Recommendation 5 (2006) “The college should develop a sustainable reiterated cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation by strengthening its information collection and dissemination for program review, and concentrating on implementation of the master plan and its ambitious planning agenda.” (Standard I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.4; IV.A).

Introduction

West Los Angeles College (WLAC) adopted its first Integrated Master Plan (IMP) in 2003, and has since steadily improved in developing, integrating, applying, assessing and revising its plans. The college has proceeded in an iterative manner. Rather than rewriting the IMP, WLAC has updated and refined its parts, adopting a new Educational Master Plan in May 2008 and revising it in 2011; adding a Student Services Plan in November 2008 and revising it in 2012; adopting a new Technology Master Plan in 2009; and updating facilities plans several times for three large bond measures. These plans have guided various groups entrusted with college decision-making, such as Divisional Council, the Enrollment Management Committee, the Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization Committee, the Student Success Committee and the Career and Technical Education (CTE) Committee, Achieving the Dream and the Student Services Council. This section of the Follow-Up Report describes and evaluates the college’s plan revisions and processes for measuring progress on plan goals.

In January 2013, WLAC embarked on a comprehensive revision of the college’s plans, intended to center college planning on educational excellence, to continue WLAC’s tradition of open and transparent processes, to more clearly identify and link program and student success data to planning and resource allocation cycles, and to result in measurable improvement to the college.

Educational Master Plan

In writing the 2008-2011 Educational Master Plan (EMP) the Academic Senate’s Educational Policies and Standards Committee (EPSC) made the decision to identify a limited number of specific goals on which the college should focus. The plan addressed WLAC’s major strengths and weaknesses as revealed by ARCC data: for example, the college’s CTE- programs exceeded the average level of achievement of colleges in its peer group, while basic skills outcomes were under par. As the Committee set out to produce a 2011-2014 EMP, the Dean of Planning and Research and the Chair of the EPSC devised an implementation matrix that the Committee used to assess progress towards achieving the goals of the 2008 plan. Discussions of the matrix by constituency representatives at committees, including the Planning Committee, contributed
to the development of the 2011 plan. While most of the major components in the 2008 plan were retained, significant changes arose from the discussion of the assessment results. For example, on the matrix it had been noted that the strategy, “require all students to participate in comprehensive orientation and assessment before class registration,” did not conform to the California Education Code, which at that point prohibited requiring orientation or assessment before registration, so the strategy in the 2011 EMP reads, “Strongly encourage all students to participate in comprehensive orientation and assessment before class registration.” The 2008 objectives were clarified as goals, and the objectives as strategies. For each 2011 strategy, implementation specifics, facilitators, and measures of achievement are now specified. For example, Objective 2 of the 2008 plan had called for a “comprehensive, integrated written plan for an effective basic skills program.” With the adoption of a Foundation Skills Plan in March 2011, the 2011 EMP Goal 4 focuses on implementing the written plan and assessing the impact of its objectives.

Both iterations of the EMP followed the same path to adoption: the EPSC recommended each plan to the Academic Senate, which after deliberation made a recommendation to the College President. The College President accepted the Academic Senate’s recommendation to adopt each plan. Following the example of the EMP, major plans identify measurable goals at the implementation-specific level. For example, the Foundation Skills Plan envisioned “Some courses ... centered around term-long projects to be presented and celebrated at the end of term.” WLAC met that goal by establishing student poster fairs in spring of 2012. The college’s Achieving the Dream (AtD) Implementation Proposal of May 2012, developed by the Student Success Committee in conjunction with the Academic Senate, selected AtD strategies that align with the EMP. The Implementation Proposal established that the Academic Senate’s Student Success Committee would oversee AtD work to ensure that it is systematically evaluated and contributes to long-term institutional improvement. The planning process included an extensive review of data and resulted in identified baselines and targets for goals. With the adoption of this proposal, the college is now able to gauge improvements in institutional effectiveness more accurately with respect to these goals. In 2012, the following AtD plans were fulfilled:

- Welcome Day (College Kickoff), a one-day event designed to help students start the semester prepared. They toured the campus, spoke with instructors, got information about majors and services, paid fees, bought books, and more.
- Faculty Inquiry Team is a District-wide team of Math faculty who engaged in conversation to develop campus-specific, faculty-generated projects intended to increase student success in the Algebra sequence.
- Faculty Inquiry Group is a group of faculty who are participating in the Reading Apprenticeship program.
- Student Poster Showcase is a unique chance for students and faculty to meet on neutral ground, see what work students are doing in different disciplines, and celebrate learning.

As the next step in the ongoing cycle of improvement in educational master planning, work on a comprehensive revision of the EMP has begun. On January 14, 2013, the College President
chaired a meeting in which he called for the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Academic Senate’s EPSC to collaborate on a revision of the EMP. The revision is to analyze program review results, other planning processes, regional demographic information and other environmental scan results, advisory committee input, and the mission and goals of the California Community Colleges, Los Angeles Community College District, and West Los Angeles College. Measurable goals and criteria for gauging progress are to be built into the design of the Plan. The college continues to recognize the need to treat the EMP as the keystone of college plans. The Student Services Plan will be subsumed into the EMP, and the EMP goals will guide facilities and technology planning.

Student Services Plan

The Vice President of Student Services and the Deans in Student Services devised the 2007-2011 Student Services Plan in support of the EMP. In this plan, strategies generally consisted of discrete tasks, implying that they were either done or not done. The 2007-2011 plan listed six goals, each with multiple objectives and strategies. It cross-referenced strategies with the Technology Plan, the Basic Skills Plan and, especially, the Educational Master Plan. Furthermore, the plan provided a responsible agent or department and an attainment date for each strategy. The 2007-2011 Student Services Plan was a living document, as evidenced by the revision in November 2008, and update in October 2009 which incorporated a summary of activities for 2007-09. The division indicated which strategies had been completed, frequently breaking down completion into a series of milestones. Out of 78 strategies, 65 had been completed by February 2010.

The Student Services Division revised the plan (now the 2011-2017 Student Services Plan) in deliberations in 2011 and early 2012, and solicited feedback from all Student Services faculty and staff at the March Student Services Council meeting as well as by e-mail. The vice president incorporated this feedback into the plan before it was adopted in October of 2012.

In its second iteration, the Student Services Plan identifies measures of achievement for strategies so that the college can better gauge its progress. It includes goals refined to better address student needs, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL 1:</strong> Decrease the number of applicants who never enroll in the college by streamlining the enrollment process.</td>
<td><strong>GOAL 1:</strong> Increase the percentage of students that use existing self service options and enhance the quality of those services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL 5:</strong> Enhance the academic preparedness of pre-collegiate students.</td>
<td><strong>GOAL 5:</strong> Explain and enforce critical Title 5 and Financial Aid policy changes that impact student progress and success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives were refined to be more measurable, such as defining the objective of goal 2 as “5% of students who were initially undecided on their major will declare their major at the end of their first year at West,” from the less-specific, “Reduce the number of undecided students by 5% every year.”

The plan states, “We anticipate substantial progress in achieving these goals by 2017.” In addition to listing strategies with those responsible for their implementation and attainment dates, the 2011-2017 plan identifies baselines against which to measure progress and specifies dates for evaluation. The division continues evaluating its progress on the current plan, as it did on the previous plan.

As part of the continuous improvement cycle, Student Services is scheduled to complete their next annual evaluation of the Plan by the end of Spring 2013. The evaluation process has already begun, with an external consultant providing feedback and concrete suggestions for enhancement.

### Technology Master Plan

The 2009-2016 Technology Master Plan (TMP) did not state its goals in measurable terms. In March 2011 the Technology Committee had set up several workgroups to evaluate the TMP goals and progress toward achievement. The task included the following areas for review:

- progress to date
- areas for improvement
- barriers to moving forward
- suggested updates or revisions to the TMP goals.

This qualitative assessment was augmented in September 2012 when the committee added the task of defining quantitatively measurable outcomes to each workgroup’s charges. At that time the Dean of Research and Planning assisted the Committee in defining measures so that progress on the goals of the plan can be assessed. Workgroups agreed to identify at least one strategy with associated measures of achievement for each goal of the TMP. By January 2013 measures had been devised to assess progress on five of the seven goals, and were included on drafts of the implementation matrices. At its February 19, 2013 meeting, the Technology Committee reviewed the measures and determined that they should be tracked as the committee works on a new TMP, aiming to present it to College Council in fall 2013.

With assistance from a consultant, the committee also recognized the need to fully update the TMP with concrete milestones, timelines and responsible persons, and committed to adding them to the plan.
Facilities Master Plan

West Los Angeles College’s greatest challenge has been in facilities planning. As reported in the 2012 Self-Study, in 2010 the college faced a nearly $124 million over-commitment of the bond funds allocated by the District for building out the campus. Well-established governance structures helped the interim president guide the college through the process of deciding how to meet the college’s needs while remaining within the budget.\(^{39}\) The college community engaged in extensive dialogue about campus needs and how to prioritize the remaining construction dollars.\(^{40}\) In the years prior to this situation, college facilities planning had focused on the completion of new buildings. The development of the 2003 Integrated Master Plan (IMP) had been spearheaded by consultants hired to prepare a plan that could be used in bond proposals. The passage of three district bond measures allowed substantial progress to be made in fulfilling that plan, and also made facilities planning more complex. The facilities section of the IMP was summarized in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for A/AA bond projects approved by the Board of Trustees in 2005.\(^{41}\) With the passage of Measure J to fund still more new projects, the Board of Trustees certified a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and a Facilities Master Plan update in August 2010.

The 2010 Facilities Master Plan\(^ {42}\) continued the nine facilities goals of the IMP:

- Goal 1: Create a state-of-the-art physical campus environment that conveys the college’s excellence and stability.
- Goal 2: Organize and develop land use activities within the campus to strengthen academic, cultural, and social interaction.
- Goal 3: Take advantage of the views from the higher locations of the campus.
- Goal 4: Create a strong, walkable, pedestrian-friendly campus core.
- Goal 5: Preserve, enhance, and restore the natural environment.
- Goal 6: Strengthen and clarify circulation systems to create a safe, convenient, and accessible environment.
- Goal 7: Maintain flexibility in use of spaces and buildings; design for future growth and expansion.
- Goal 8: Create a strong sense of place that supports the academic and social life of the college.
- Goal 9: Strengthen physical connections and campus activities that serve the surrounding community.

The 2010 plan addressed these goals without tying specific actions to them. For example, the following language in the plan clearly addresses goal 6, even though the connection is not explicitly stated:

Universal design considerations for people with mobility limitations, visual impairments, or other disabilities are incorporated into the overall design for campus accessibility, as the multiple levels and steep slopes of the existing campus present unique challenges. Campus vehicle circulation is addressed in the Master Plan relative to clarifying and distinguishing desired circulation patterns and entry points, while providing a pedestrian-
oriented campus.

The legal status of each of these EIR documents meant making any changes to them prohibitively expensive. Further complicating facilities planning for the college was the matter of WLAC’s relationship with its neighbors. WLAC is an island of instructional use in a sea of residential development. In the past this has created conflicts between the college and surrounding homeowners over campus land use, traffic and noise impacts of construction, and the community’s access to college amenities, such as the track and pedestrian walkways. Often joining the disputes on the side of the homeowners was the City of Culver City, which surrounds the college.

Years of conflict gave way to memoranda of understanding between West Los Angeles College and local homeowners associations (HOAs) and, more recently, a “Settlement Agreement” between the college and Culver City. Relationships have improved and the college administration, City officials and HOA representatives continue to meet semiannually to review the status of the Settlement Agreement and the degree of compliance by the college with the stipulations in the EIR. These relationships must be factored in to updates to facilities plans.

Although the EIR documents referenced the goals of the 2003 IMP, they focused on the construction of new buildings, the removal of old ones, and associated adjustments to roads and other campus infrastructure. A Building Program Management Committee (BPMC) tracked progress on the bond-funded projects, in effect treating their completion as the measures of progress on the plan’s goals. The Work Environment Committee dealt with any pressing issues beyond the scope of the bond projects. Recognizing the need to conduct more robust facilities planning within long-established governance structures, in 2011 the College Council revived the Facilities Committee, replacing the BPMC.

Since its resurrection, the Facilities Committee has had a full agenda, as in late 2011 the district imposed a building moratorium and required each college to demonstrate its needs for additional construction before allowing projects to continue. Demonstrating such needs involved extensive data-based research and deliberation which reached completion only in early 2013.

The committee coordinated space needs assessments done from multiple points of view:

- Conducted a review of existing spaces and correlated them to state standards for community colleges.
- Took into account Academic Affairs’ review of its scheduling data, attending to conflicts in high-demand time slots and for specific types of instructional spaces.
- Consulted the facilities needs report generated from 2012 program reviews.

In December 2012 the Facilities Committee adopted the findings of the architect’s space study and advanced the matter to the College Council, which also approved the study. In January 2013 the space analysis entered a new phase: (1) assessing current unmet demand for instruction that had not been accommodated in existing facilities, and (2) estimating growth in student demand projected out through the remaining 10-year horizon of the EIR. At its January 2013 meeting, the Facilities Committee began its review of the results of this second phase of the
campus space analysis.\textsuperscript{53}

While overseeing this time-critical process, which is part of the over-all facilities planning process, the Facilities Committee is also working to refine facilities planning. In July of 2012 it formed a workgroup to establish measurable outcomes for the broader goals in the Facilities Plan. The group developed a matrix including measures of achievement and progress towards each goal, as well as relationships with Educational Master Plan goals and objectives.\textsuperscript{54} Work continues, including using the data produced in the Program Review process to measure progress on facilities.\textsuperscript{55} The Facilities Committee is also working to consolidate, update, and specify the goals in the various facilities planning documents.

At the conclusion of these facilities planning processes the college will produce the following:

- A California Environmental Quality Act compliance action, either a supplement to the existing EIR or a negative declaration attesting to no environmental impacts; and
- A modification to the Settlement Agreement with the City of Culver City establishing a new timeline and incorporating other changes in response to the new master plan.

The committee’s ultimate goal is to produce an updated and expanded Facilities Master Plan that explicitly supports the Educational Master Plan; specifies goals in measurable terms, with baselines and targets; and reflects new building priorities as well as a maintenance and operations element that addresses the total cost of ownership of the college’s physical plant.

The need to base the Facilities Plan on the overarching goals of the EMP presents a challenge, as the revision to the EMP will proceed over the next year, and these planning activities will have to be closely coordinated.

Since its adoption in 2008, the EMP has been the lead plan at West Los Angeles College, as illustrated in the document “Planning Connections: Alignment of Goals and SLOs.”\textsuperscript{56} During the program review process all goals developed by programs must be aligned with one or more goals of the EMP, as can be seen in the program review form itself\textsuperscript{57} and as reported from the program review unit plans.\textsuperscript{58} In addition, program review guides respondents to report on how well their programs meet the goals of the EMP, and to set related goals at the unit level. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee evaluates and prioritizes requests for new resources based in part on their linkage to the EMP. The Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization (FPIP) Committee does not consider new positions unless they, too, are linked to the EMP, via program review. This requirement is part of the FPIP Policy\textsuperscript{59} and is enforced in practice.\textsuperscript{60} The college recognizes the need to use its established deliberative processes to create a new EMP that can guide other college plans, and to identify mechanisms to measure progress towards all identified college goals.

Please see also the response to Recommendation 2 for coverage of integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and evaluation through the program review cycle.
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In order to increase effectiveness and improve its compliance with the Standard, the college should develop and implement a formal, organized process that is regularly evaluated for assuring quality of data and assessment definitions, interpretation, and application that builds upon the established governance and planning system. This will further college efforts to develop a process where decisions are based on a culture of evidence that results in cohesive planning, evaluation, improvement and re-evaluation. (Standard I.B.3; IV.A.1).

Introduction

This response focuses on program review; the responses to recommendations 3 and 4 describe and evaluate closely-related work done on Student Learning Outcomes, Service Area Outcomes, and Service Level Outcomes.

A key arena for dialogue about student learning and the improvement of programs, services and operations at West Los Angeles College is program review. WLAC has been engaged in program review since 1999, steadily improving its process over time to employ reliable qualitative and quantitative information, and to systematically channel the results of informed self-reflection into institutional improvement. The process is now fully online, with significant data provided for the authors—program review managers and program review team members. It integrates with resource allocation through a process that is grounded in WLAC’s established structures of participatory governance. A revision of the instrument systematically precedes each round of program review. In 2012 this revision focused on including measurable goals for each program and using them to assess progress. Improvements for the 2012-2013 cycle include fuller data collection and analysis, especially in assessing the effects of resource allocations; more robust validation and prioritization, both guided by rubrics; and the evaluation of these changes at the end of the 2012-2013 fiscal and academic year. Definitions of terms have been added to the Program Review Handbook; definitions were reinforced during program review workshops; and definitions were further clarified through the validation process.

A History of Campus-wide Reflection

Since 1999, WLAC has conducted program reviews for all programs in the Student Services, Academic Affairs and Administrative Services Divisions, generally on a yearly cycle. Administrators, staff and faculty all participate in program review; depending on the program being assessed, the responsibility for writing the program review falls to administrators (principally deans), staff (mostly program managers) and faculty (chairs of instructional divisions, regular faculty and adjunct faculty). Requests for new resources originate in the planning sections of program reviews. The Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization process (FPIP), a well-developed and well-accepted process under the purview of the Academic Senate, considers only faculty positions that have been previously identified in program review and linked to the goals of the Educational Master Plan. In 2008, program review moved to an electronic platform, using a web-based software developed by a consultant. For the 2010 cycle, the Program Review Committee evaluated the previous
process and decided to use a different system, including revised questions, while retaining the basic program review process. The 2010 cycle collected responses using PDF forms from which the Office of Research and Planning could create a database and produce reports. The program review instrument required that program goals explicitly link to institutional goals and to program assessment results, including SLO assessments. Action plans were linked to program goals. Program review authors indicated for each action whether additional resources would be required, and resource requests followed from that indication. The instrument also elicited the impact of each action on other programs. A validation process followed the submission of program reviews, and validators—generally deans, Vice Presidents, or teams of these--returned some program reviews to areas for changes and further editing. These program reviews were then re-submitted for additional validation until they were approved by the validators. Following this, a prioritized list of all the requests fed into the budget development process.

The quality of submitted program 2010 reviews was uneven, as the 2012 evaluation team noted. The planned 2011 program review cycle was modified, and called for program reviews to be conducted in spring rather than fall. Thus, the spring 2011 program reviews consisted of updates. For the 2012-2013 cycle, WLAC returned to doing program review in the fall, and inaugurated a new program review platform, the district’s Institutional Effectiveness System (IES).

IES: A Milestone in Program Review Integration

In late 2008 a College Collaborative Taskforce involving faculty and researchers from all nine LACCD colleges, and chaired by WLAC’s Dean, Research and Planning, began work on identifying and developing online software to support planning and program review. After investigating commercially-available software and finding none that met identified needs, the taskforce began working with district IT to add an online program review to the other district-wide applications supported by the SAP software that runs many of the district’s information systems. The taskforce worked closely with district IT to design modules that allow faculty, staff and administration to work together online in the creation, validation and use of program reviews. In the fall of 2012, WLAC was the first college to use the new district Institutional Effectiveness System (IES) application. The IES facilitates collaboration and discussion:

- IES provides the flexibility to accommodate teams with access to specific program reviews.
- Collaboration can be asynchronous, with individuals working when they have the time, and saving changes so that they are available to the rest of the team.
- IES is accessible from off campus, allowing team members to work from home. This was a key requirement of the taskforce, and one shared with only one other LACCD SAP application.
- Web links provide key data within the program review application.
- Instructions are available for each page in the online program review document, thus including the ability to provide definitions of terms as they are needed during the writing of a program review.

The system is flexible, allowing for the addition of components; a place holder now indicates where SLO assessment results will be accommodated in subsequent development. The software
was developed with the understanding that major updates will be made on at least an annual basis. At a meeting to plan next steps in software development in January 2013, college representatives met with an LACCD Information Technology manager and five involved programmers to discuss the identified areas in which to focus future development. These include the ability to attach and upload documents to program reviews and design of the roll-over capability.

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee and the 2012-2013 Cycle

The Planning Committee and the Program Review Committee used their annual review of the program review process to prepare for the inauguration of IES, as well as to address the recommendations of the 2012 evaluation team. In September 2012 the College Council reorganized the two committees as a single Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee. Like its predecessors, the PIE Committee has broad representation, including faculty, administrators, staff, and students; it mirrors the representation allotted each group in the College Council. In support of its work in overseeing the college’s planning and other processes designed to improve institutional effectiveness, the PIE Committee is charged with coordinating program review and with using the results to provide the Budget Committee and the College Council with allocation recommendations. Another of its responsibilities is to “systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the program review process, recommend improvements, and coordinate implementation of approved improvements.”

Based on its assessment of the 2010-2011 cycle, the PIE Committee moved program review back to the fall, and made additions to the 2012-13 program review instrument:

- Assessment of progress on division/department goals
- Evaluation of the effects of resources requested/received over the past two years
- Documentation of faculty dialogue regarding SLO assessment results and improvement plans
- Response to recommendations from the prior program review (a requirement that had applied only to non-instructional programs in 2010-11)
- Table of course Student Learning Outcomes, assessment methods, summaries of results, planned actions, and whether or not the planned actions will require additional resources
- A similar table of program outcomes
- Separate assessment plans for course and program outcomes
- A new module on challenges and goals related to facilities, and how the facilities goals relate to the Educational Master Plan and the program’s overall goals
- A new module on the likely implications of budgetary reductions and of program termination
- Assessment of the impact of improvements in CTE programs
- Measurable results at the planning goal level

A major addition to the program review process in 2012 was a review during the validation phase of data related to program viability. The program viability process defined by the Academic Senate specifies certain data, already reported and responded to in program review, that may indicate the need for a program viability study. The program viability process has not been used in the past. With the addition of a review of viability indicators, two programs have requested viability studies of their programs, Applied Technology and HLRC.
With each program’s evidence-based assessment of progress on its own previously-identified goals, of the effects of prior resource allocations or lack thereof, and of learning and other applicable outcomes, program review now anchors an ongoing cycle of planning, evaluation, improvement, and re-evaluation aimed at systematically enhancing student learning and institutional effectiveness.

To prepare the college community to use the IES system, the Dean of Research and Planning conducted seven workshops in October and November and provided a Program Review Handbook online and in hard copy. Sections of the Handbook were also used in hands-on activities at the November 2012 Leadership Retreat. In addition to documenting the use of the software and the revised instrument, the Handbook outlines all the steps of the program review process:

- Program review production and submission
- Validation
- Vice Presidents’ prioritization of resource requests in their areas
- PIE Committee and College Council prioritization of resource requests college-wide
- Budget Preparation.

In addition to introducing the IES software, workshops stressed the role of validation in ensuring the quality of program reviews. The workshops also emphasized the role of program reviews in such planning processes as goal setting, resource allocation and review of program viability indicators. Also discussed in workshops was the importance of developing unit goals which are defined in such a way that progress can be evaluated.

Much of the data included in program review to inform program assessment of progress was similar to that used in prior program reviews. The specific data elements and categories for summarizing the data are refined when the process is evaluated prior to each cycle. Five-year trend data is provided with summaries at the discipline, division and college levels. Trend data related to enrollment includes enrollment, FTES, section counts, and average class size. Student achievement outcomes data for retention rates and success rates, as well as program completion, is presented. For all but program completion, data is summarized by mode of instructional delivery, including classroom, online, hybrid, as well as other specialized programs such as week-end college and cohort programs. Student demographic trends in gender, age group and ethnic group distributions are presented. FTEF trends by mode of instructional delivery and regular/adjunct/hourly are presented. The data are made available in several ways: links within the online program review document; online at the program review web site; and printed copies prepared, along with other program review materials, and given to each program review manager. For the first time in fall 2012, expenditure and budget data summarized by academic division, for both restricted and unrestricted funds, was made available to inform responses to several questions.

Data definitions are provided in the Program Review Handbook, and were discussed at the program review workshops. The quality of the data provided in program review is ensured initially by careful compilation and creation of reports. The source for the data is the District SIS
database and budget queries that are in constant use by many people. Further, the same data and queries have been used in three prior program review cycles, and any errors are corrected as they are identified. The same data that are contained in the program review reports are used from time to time in other contexts providing additional means of ensuring accuracy. For example, the same data are used in presentations to the Enrollment Management Committee and to academic division meetings. The validation process can also contribute to broad understanding of the data definitions since misconceptions revealed in the program review can be addressed by the validator.

A Dean in the Office of Instruction wrote about the 2012-2013 program review cycle:

[authors] are making strong links between Planning (SLOs and instructional outcomes) with allocations for funds (salary, equipment) and space needs. This is a general observation for all reviews. The level of review was intense; chairs and faculty asked for additional time with deadlines to complete the reviews. The message that PR was essential to college planning and funding allocation was received and had an impact on chairs and faculty. Responses were thoughtful and more focused on student outcomes than in previous reviews. Some divisions were more inclusive than before. The emphasis on SLOs underscored the relationship to student achievement and completion to planning and budget. There seem to be many steps, but the overall effect is to focus the responders on the interconnectedness of data driven decisions and their outcomes.  

Communication about program review and student learning has improved substantially. For example, the Language Arts Division uses Etudes (the college’s online course management system) as a supplement to division meetings to facilitate faculty participation in and dialogue about the division’s program review. Division minutes reflect dialog on the achievement of Student Learning Outcomes across several meetings. At the meeting of November 5, Language Arts faculty discussed with the Dean of Research and Planning the significance of measurable goal setting and of aligning division goals with college goals. In addition, there was discussion about ways to enhance student learning in English 21 and in the ESL series. At still another division meeting, SLO assessments and assessment rubrics were discussed for several English courses. The resulting evaluation is registered in the division’s 2012 program review.

Yet another division, Allied Health, engaged in substantial discussion about student success, pedagogical strategies, and impacts of various efforts at its division meetings.

The revised program review process improved not only dialogue within divisions, but also dialogue during the validation of program reviews. In the winter of 2012-2013, validations were done by teams, guided by a detailed set of questions. Enhanced dialogue occurred in two contexts: first, the validation teams discussed and shared ideas about the program review they were validating. This proved to be a useful learning experience for the team members as they learned how others viewed the same program review, and developed their understanding of program review and planning. Second, when the validation comments were shared with the program review authors, another opportunity for dialogue occurred.

Examples of the questions used to guide validation include:
• Department Purpose - Is the Purpose of the division/ department/ program clearly stated and aligned with the college vision and mission?
• Student Learning Outcomes – Is the information presented accurate? Is the area meeting college goals for assessment completion? Is the area using assessment results for program improvement? Include any other comments you may have on this section.
• Unit Goal – Are the goal(s) SMART (strategic, measureable, actionable, realistic and timely) and related to college goals and planning? Is achievement of the goal measureable?
• Planned Action – Is the Planned Action linked with a Unit Goal, and logically related to that Goal? Are the expected results of the Action explained?
• Resource Request – Is the Resource Request linked to a Planned Action? Is the Resource Request appropriate to the Planned Action?

Program reviews were returned for revision when they did not provide the required levels of information or analysis. An example of the kind of change that was made through the validation process took place with the International Students Program. The originally-requested new staffing was inappropriate, so the program review was returned so that the appropriate position could be requested. Over 40% program reviews were returned at least once for revision; however, ultimately, 94% of program reviews/validations were completed. Although the IES’ term for returning a program review for revision—“rejection”—may have been harsh, the process did foster dialogue. In another case, the Language Arts Division program review was initially rejected because it was incomplete, in part because the authors had overlooked some fields. In revising it, however, they also recognized gaps in facilities needs identification, which they corrected and which then entered into the facilities needs assessment process noted in Recommendation 1.

The Student Services Division Vice President and Deans validated program reviews in a divisional retreat which facilitated a free flow of information and ideas. Teams of deans working together on validations gained valuable insight; for example, the Dean of Teaching and Learning worked with a Dean in the Office of Instruction to validate the Mathematics Division’s program review, providing added clarity on the division’s SLO process. As stated in the validation comments for this program review,

Some Math classes had existing SLO's but now all courses have identified SLO's, assessment methods and criterion levels. Each course will be assessed in the Fall 12 semester and will be analyzed. This division is very data driven in its decision-making, and planning. 34

In a pilot of cross-area validation, Deans from Student Services and Academic Affairs together worked on the program reviews for allied health, transfer and matriculation. Validation was so intensive that it required deadline extensions, and was not finished until the beginning of February.

In the development of the 2013-2014 budget, program reviews provide all requests for new resources. Because of delay in validation, each Vice President reviewed his division’s requests and provide a prioritized list to the PIE Committee in February. 35 On a parallel track, the PIE
Committee was able to use a mixture of validated and draft program reviews to advance the broader planning process. At its January 23, 2013 meeting the PIE Committee continued its work of producing a prioritization rubric for resource requests, based on the college’s Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services. The prioritization rubric was approved at the PIE Committee meeting of February 13, 2013. Thus, the Vice Presidents had a draft rubric to consider as they produced their rankings, and the PIE Committee is on track to complete its prioritization on schedule, March 8, 2013. In April the College Council will review the resulting list and make its recommendations to the college president, who will make the final decision on the priorities which will guide the preparation of the 2013-2014 budget.

This process complements the long-established FPIP process. Requests for new faculty positions are not included in the PIE Committee’s prioritization, but are reviewed by a committee of faculty and administrators which produces a prioritized list of faculty positions to be filled. The FPIP Committee has systematically revised its processes since its inception in the late 1990s, refining the data and rubrics it uses. Each year the Academic Senate reviews FPIP policies, so they are widely understood and respected. The FPIP policy that all regular faculty positions be requested initially through program review prior to the established deadline is enforced. For example, in the 2012-13 cycle, FPIP requests were submitted for three positions after the deadline; those requests were not included in the FPIP prioritization process.

In 2013 the PIE and Budget Committees inaugurated a process of twice-yearly joint meetings. The first of the two meetings, designed to focus on effective utilization of financial resources, occurred February 28, 2013. The other will be held in July 2013 to evaluate the planning cycle itself. The committees use numerous sources of information to evaluate the effective use of financial resources in the 2011-2012 budget, and the 2012-2013 allocations for which preliminary data is already available. These sources include the following:

- College Mission, Vision and Values
- Outcomes and goal achievement data for master plans, ARCC, and institutional effectiveness indicators
- 2012 program reviews, including impact of prior resource allocations or lack thereof, assessment of progress in meeting prior goals, and new unit goals
- Budget data

In preparation for the first joint meeting, the PIE Committee began analysis of the available data at its meeting of January 23, 2013. The committee discussed draft reports generated from program review responses that can inform an assessment of the effective utilization of financial resources. The reports are posted at the program review web site, and include:

- Impact of Resource Allocation on Unit
- Impact of Potential 5% Budget Cut on Unit
- Assessment of Progress in Meeting Prior Goals
- Unit Goal Outcome Measures
- SLO Assessments and Changes.
The PIE Committee prepared a summary of program review data for presentation to the Joint Committee Meeting, along with the other data called for in the plan. A further outcome of the January meeting was identification of areas of improvement needed in the program review process and documentation. As preparation for the systematic review to be conducted in July 2013, notes about these areas are specifically maintained to facilitate that evaluation.

At the Joint Meeting scheduled in July, 2013, the two committees will complete their evaluation of the 2012 program review process, update it and set the calendar for the 2013 process. In fall 2012 the college had engaged a consultant who reviewed planning and program review procedures for cohesion, incorporation of existing policies, and meaningful evaluation. As further preparation for the July meeting, consultant recommendations for the improvement of the program review process have been evaluated, and those that cannot be implemented in the current cycle will be considered for implementation in the next cycle. This document and other evaluation already underway suggests areas for improvement, including clarifying program review instructions, providing the validation and prioritization rubrics to the program review authors before program review begins, including the president’s office in program review, and clarifying the definition of a program.

Wide dissemination of a new edition of the Program Review Handbook in early fall 2013 will further solidify the process and make it clear to the entire college community.

The PIE Committee is also charged with guiding the college, through the appropriate committees, in evaluating progress towards the goals of the Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan, Student Services Plan, and Facilities Plan, in part by using the results of program review. As noted under Recommendation 1, for example, the Student Services Plan has been updated twice since 2007, partially in response to issues identified in the program reviews of the Division.

---
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RECOMMENDATION 3 – Student Learning Outcomes (2012)

As noted by the 2006 team and in order to fully meet the Standards and facilitate the college’s achievement of commission expectations of proficiency by AY 2012-13, the team recommends that the college identify student learning outcomes that are related to course objectives for all courses; evaluate all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of the relevance, appropriateness, and achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans; and conduct authentic assessment of student achievement at the course, program, and institutional levels in order to improve student learning. (Standard II.A.1.c, 2.a, 2.e, 2.f, 2.h, 2.i; II.B.4; II.C.2., IV.A.2.b.)

Introduction

In its first decade working with Student Learning Outcomes, West Los Angeles College (WLAC) implemented a cycle of SLO identification, assessment, discussion, and improvement. The project, initially faculty-led, expanded steadily with the assistance of significant resources including dedicated administrators and staff. After the visiting team of March 2012 pointed out that the college needed to identify course-level SLOs, the college committed to an ambitious plan of work to identify course-level SLOs and complete the cycle of assessment, dialogue, and improvements.

Establishing a System of SLO Assessment, 2002-2012

As described in the 2006 Self Study,¹ faculty began work WLAC’s SLO cycle in 2002, identifying Institutional SLOs and adopting them in 2005. The 2009 Focused Midterm Report² continues the timeline: 34 of the college’s 37 majors had Program SLOs, as had six other academic programs; course outlines of record indicated the Institutional or Program SLOs associated with the course. In 2006, the college had begun an SLO Portfolio Project³ to capture SLO assessment, with about 25% of the faculty starting the project each year through 2009. However, this project was not based on Course SLOs. Instead, instructors were including Institutional (“College”) or Program SLOs in their course outlines, and assessing those SLOs in their courses.

WLAC described its SLO assessment procedure in its 2009 Focused Midterm Report:⁴

In the past two years, we have concentrated on helping faculty develop single-course assessments of student SLO achievement. So far, 61 (out of 70 fulltime) faculty have posted SLO portfolios containing the following documentation:

- Teacher Name
- Class Name & Number – for example: English 101
- College SLO and/or Program SLO
- Assessment Instrument/Assignment/Exam Question—designed to determine how well students achieve the SLO
- Rating Scale – descriptions of scores 6 highest through 1 lowest (or A through F)
- 5-6 Sample papers, projects, or written exams to illustrate grades of 6 through 1 (or A through F)—one of each
- Faculty member’s reflection on the process—What did I learn? What do I want to change?

West Los Angeles College had allocated faculty reassigned time for an SLO Coordinator and administrative support\(^5\) to shepherd the institutionalization of the SLO assessment cycle. The SLO Coordinator and other faculty and administrators had attended workshops, including several held on campus.

Three faculty members attended the WASC and AAHE conference held in Hawaii from January 28-30, 2010 and returned energized to continue this process, focusing particularly on faculty dialogue on assessment results, leading to improved teaching and learning.\(^6\)

Over the course of his work, WLAC’s original SLO Coordinator achieved statewide prominence.\(^7\) He also served on the SLO Assessment Guidelines Ad Hoc Committee that wrote \textit{Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment} that was adopted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in fall 2010.\(^8\) WLAC’s first SLO Coordinator retired in June 2010.

In February 2011, a new SLO Coordinator was hired. He participates on the district-level SLO Advisory Committee and serves as Co-Chair of WLAC’s SLO Committee. He spearheaded expanding the scope of SLO development, review and revision beyond the previous focus on academic SLOs to include all divisions and programs in the college, including a systematic approach to the SLO cycle.\(^9\) To support this wider sweep, the college created an SLO taskforce (which evolved into an SLO Committee reporting to the Academic Senate through the Curriculum Committee) with representatives from the three major divisions of the college (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services).\(^10\) The SLO Coordinator is a resource to the Curriculum Committee on technical review of courses, and reports at all Academic Senate meetings on SLO progress.\(^11\)

In August 2011, the college hired a Dean of Teaching and Learning. She provides leadership over SLOs, supervising the SLO Coordinator, and co-chairing the SLO Committee.\(^12\)

WLAC continued to fine-tune its SLO assessment cycle. In 2011, the Senate approved assessment tools that faculty could use to more easily assess student learning outcomes for courses and programs, and that also clearly aligned courses with both Institutional and Program SLOs.\(^13\) The new SLO Coordinator held one-on-one training sessions and workshops\(^14\) with faculty, and the SLO Committee mounted an extensive video tutorial on the college website,\(^15\) along with focused and comprehensive reports\(^16\) on all course SLO work completed to date, including graphics\(^17\) conveying the work for the path to proficiency. The SLO Committee also developed and distributed a Year-in-Review 2011-2012 report\(^18\) that included SLO History and Assessment Plans, SLO Reports, SLO Process Diagrams, SLO Assessment, and SLO Committee Meeting Minutes. The SLO Coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning presented these reports at Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, and Divisional Council meetings.\(^19\) Division chairs included the results of SLO assessments in annual program reviews.\(^20\)
At the writing of the 2012 Self Study in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation, ninety-seven percent of the courses taught in the previous two years had been assessed for the achievement of Program or Institutional SLOs. To be clear, the college had identified course SLOs during the Program SLO development process, and faculty were required to file a comprehensive SLO assessment for each course taught each semester. The SLO Coordinator tracked and reported progress in assessing Program and Institutional SLOs at the course level. Furthermore, the required documentation now included the following:

- Report of Data (the breakdown of student scores for the assessment)
- Plan of action aimed at changes to improve student learning for the SLOs assessed
- Changes already implemented based on the previous assessment cycle
- Plans for sharing the results of the assessment

At that point, all courses taught at WLAC had an ongoing SLO assessment as part of a three-semester SLO review cycle (semester 1--assess; semester 2--discuss results; semester 3--implement changes). This cycle fed into the annual program review process, in which each unit reported on its progress assessing SLOs, results of assessment, as well as any changes resulting from the assessment.

The AFT Faculty Guild and the Board of Trustees had clarified full- and part-time faculty obligations in the contract, and the Planning and Program Review Committees modified instruments to fold SLO assessment into planning. Questions were added to Program Review to capture assessment plans, changes made as a result of assessment, and if changes would require a resource request. In addition, faculty indicated if a planned goal was developed as a result of outcomes assessment.

### Identifying Course SLOs

On the basis of this work, most members of the College community regarded institutional progress on outcomes as robust. As the 2012 Visiting Team pointed out, however, WLAC instructors were generally measuring Program SLOs in their courses, rather than identifying and assessing specific Course SLOs.

Although the college was deeply invested in an SLO process that worked down from Institutional SLOs, through Program SLOs, to the assessment of courses, the 2012 Evaluation Report and subsequent Commission letter helped the college as a whole understand the value of linking course objectives to SLOs specific to each course. Recognizing the scale of the task at hand, WLAC engaged a consultant to review its SLO processes. His preliminary recommendations helped the SLO Committee draft an ambitious plan of action, which the college adopted through its participatory governance process. WLAC has now undertaken to work up from the course level to the institutional level, an organic shift of focus within the established process.

In July 2012 the Accreditation Steering committee asked various established committees to form workgroups to address the recommendations. An SLO Workgroup, comprised of members
of the SLO Committee, formed and agreed to meet twice a month to spearhead the refinement of the SLO process.\textsuperscript{31}

At the August 2012 Flex Day, 140 full- and part-time faculty attended breakout sessions related to student success, articulation and transfer, planning and program review, and SLOs. The SLO Coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning led a breakout session on \textit{Linking SLOs and Pedagogy: Rubrics, Assessment, and Faculty Dialogue}.\textsuperscript{32} In this session, faculty discussed ways to engage in dialogue at meetings such as monthly division meetings, Divisional Council, interdisciplinary workshops and retreats, and participants developed a rubric for assessing a course SLO. The SLO Coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning presented the first edition of \textit{SLO News}, the monthly SLO Newsletter\textsuperscript{33} that includes information on SLO progress, SLO tips, and upcoming workshops and events. The SLO Newsletter continues to be published and distributed monthly.\textsuperscript{34}

The timeline\textsuperscript{35} agreed to by the Academic Senate, College Council, and appropriate committees (Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, Curriculum and SLO Committees)\textsuperscript{36} in September is ambitious:

- By the end the fall 2012 semester, develop one or more course SLOs based on course objectives for all courses taught in fall 2012.
- Upon development of course SLOs, faculty assess, discuss SLO assessment results, using them to evaluate all courses for:
  - Course SLOs
  - Achievement of those SLOs
  - Currency.
- The fall 2012 Program Review incorporates a summary of SLO assessment to link assessment with planning and resource requests.
- In spring 2013, faculty incorporate improvements determined via course SLO assessment.
- Continue to conduct authentic assessment of student achievement at the course, program, and institutional levels.
- Continue to use results of assessment at all levels to improve student learning.

To facilitate this work, the Academic Senate approved an SLO addendum to the Course Outline of Record, and the Curriculum Committee doubled its normal meeting schedule to have more opportunities for acceptance of SLO Addendums.\textsuperscript{37} The SLO Addendum\textsuperscript{38} includes course objectives and requires Course SLOs, corresponding assessment methods, and the criterion level indicating satisfactory performance on each SLO. In addition, each course SLO is mapped to Program and Institutional SLOs.

The college’s annual 2012 Leadership Retreat was designed to engage 120 faculty, staff, administrators and students in using data, especially SLO assessments, in planning to improve the college. Breakout sessions included reading materials related to SLO development and assessment and integration with program review and planning, and then making posters that demonstrate the process.\textsuperscript{39} In addition, faculty and staff reported out the process through “tweets” and photos on Twitter. Participants explained their posters, such as the “nuts and bolts”
of SLO development, Bloom’s Taxonomy, course objectives vs. SLOs, and continuous improvement.

Between August and November 2012, the SLO coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning reviewed the course outlines of record to identify the gaps in Course SLOs for all currently-taught courses. The SLO Committee prepared a list of the courses that required new Course SLOs. To facilitate their identification and documentation, the SLO Committee published a handbook on Course SLO Development.

The consultant provided a Gap Analysis on Oct. 15, 2012, in which he detailed what the college needs to do, not only to achieve our goals for this year, but to sustain a meaningful cycle of assessment, discussion, improvement and reassessment. The SLO Committee began discussing the report at its October 25, 2012 meeting and at the November 5, 2012 meeting of the SLO Workgroup. The consultant also attended SLO Committee and Workgroup meetings to discuss the report and advise on next steps. The SLO Committee incorporated the recommendations from the Analysis into the SLO cycle at WLAC.

The Academic Senate also discussed these pressing tasks at length at its Oct. 23 meeting. Acknowledging the amount of work to be done in two semesters, Senators urged that the faculty continue in the ambitious task of identifying (where necessary) and assessing an SLO for each course taught in the fall 2012 semester, noting that SLO assessment is part of a cycle of continuous improvement, so that getting started is itself valuable and imperative.

The SLO Coordinator conducted Course SLO Development Training with Division Chairs, Curriculum Committee members and area Deans, met with representatives from all of WLAC’s 14 instructional divisions to discuss course SLO development and review the handbook, held open SLO labs on Monday and Wednesday afternoons to train individual faculty members, and was also available by appointment.

Despite the focused nature of the timeline to complete course SLO development, a commitment to quality has pervaded the entire process. Faculty, Division Chairs and Office of Instruction Deans participated in detailed training on SLO development and gained a clear understanding of the connection between the course objectives and their overarching student learning outcomes. Faculty who teach the actual courses in need of an SLO developed them. Many utilized the additional SLO Hours (one-on-one sessions with the SLO Coordinator, offered twice a week), to clarify the process and hone their skills even further. In Fall 2012 and Winter 2013, 79 such one-on-one and small group sessions were held.

After faculty developed the course SLO based on the course objectives, they reviewed the SLO with their Division Chair, who then sent it to the SLO Coordinator. He reviewed each one, and confirmed that it was robust, based on the course objectives, and accompanied by at least one sound, authentic assessment method and a criterion level for achievement, so that future assessments would foster stronger student learning and better courses over time. Lastly, the area Deans reviewed the course SLOs to make sure that there was alignment with the Institutional and Program Learning Outcomes for each course SLO developed. The Checklist on page 13 of the
SLO Handbook – *Back to the Basics: Course SLO Development* – served as a guide in reviewing course SLOs.\(^{51}\)

One example of how this communication cycle has taken place was the evolution of English Course SLOs in mid-November 2012. The division originally designated as a real-world outcome the development of progressively better essays for courses in the composition sequence. After review with the SLO Coordinator, the division arrived at a consensus to use essays as the assessment method for these courses, and the English 101 outcome became “Argue a point and support it (in writing) using extensive evidence from outside sources.” Faculty discussed this change in division meetings and continued the conversation on email.\(^{52}\) The process was very engaging and allowed for input and collaboration by faculty.

On Oct. 17, the Curriculum Committee accepted 119 updated course outlines with course SLOs; 46 on Oct. 31, 124 on Nov. 19, 87 on Nov. 28, 85 on Dec. 12, and 96 on Jan. 22. Currently, 95% of all courses offered in fall 2012 have developed Course SLOs. The remaining courses are scheduled for review at the March 2013 Curriculum Committee meeting. Faculty have met the challenge of creating high-quality SLOs and associated assessment methods with criterion levels for achievement for all courses taught in fall 2012 or scheduled for spring 2013. Going forward, Course SLOs will be included in the systematic evaluation of the relevance, appropriateness, and achievement of student learning outcomes through the six-year Course Outline of Record update cycle.

The Office of Instruction collects faculty syllabi for all courses taught each semester. In fall of 2012 the Vice President of Academic Affairs oversaw a review of each syllabus for the inclusion of SLOs. Staff trained by the SLO Coordinator assisted in the process to collect and review syllabi for SLO inclusion. The Office of Instruction contacted faculty who did not have SLOs listed. A Fall 2012 SLO Bulletin\(^{53}\) was also developed and shared with faculty for specific information about SLOs and where to find them for inclusion on syllabi. Most of the SLOs included on fall syllabi were Program or Institutional SLOs; the same process is scheduled for Spring 2013, with syllabi to include Course SLOs. Approved Course SLOs have been posted on the SLO website\(^{54}\) for faculty to view Course SLOs across the college and to access the Course SLOs for inclusion on their syllabi. A Spring 2013 SLO Bulletin\(^{55}\) was distributed on February 1, 2013, with updated information for faculty.

**Course SLO Assessment**

WLAC is engaged in an organized, focused approach to identify Course SLOs in all current courses and to conduct authentic assessments of them. As indicated in the approved timeline above, after development of Course SLOs, faculty agreed to assess each course taught in fall 2012 and to discuss the results of the assessments to determine what, if any changes need to be made in the course, the SLO, or the assessment. Faculty are currently completing this stage in the cycle.

To assist in assessment of fall Course SLOs, the SLO committee published a second SLO Handbook – *Back to the Basics: Course SLO Assessment*.\(^{56}\) In addition, workshops and one-on-one sessions were scheduled. SLO Hours were also available for faculty conducting SLO
assessment. Finally, an invitation to apply to be an SLO Leader and/or Coach was sent to the faculty in December 2012. Three faculty members were selected, and the SLO Coordinator has trained them as SLO Leaders, who will assist other faculty as needed with their work on the instructional SLO cycle during spring 2013. These SLO Leaders receive modest stipends for their work. Additional faculty will be recruited and trained. At the training for the SLO Leaders, Division Chairs also participated in a review of course SLO development and assessment. Both SLO Handbooks were reviewed at the training.

Four workshops in January brought 15 faculty together to discuss the course SLOs they had measured in the fall semester, results of assessment, and changes to implement based on assessment. Some faculty worked in teams to combine assessment results from multiple sections of the same course. Others discussed assessment results and decided to adjust criterion levels. Another faculty commented on revising how assignments are weighted in her class. Faculty reported SLO assessments on the Course SLO Assessment Tool, which was updated to include information from the course SLO Addendum such as the criterion level and course SLO mapping. In addition, it includes updated language and instructions that the SLO Committee approved to improve clarity and ease-of-use.

By early February, 69 assessments had been documented. The remaining Course SLO assessments were due Feb. 28, 2013.

Division Chairs scheduled Division meetings for early February to complete assessment of fall 2012 courses and engage in division-wide dialogue about assessment and spring 2013 improvements for teaching and learning. The February 5, 2013 Divisional Council meeting agenda included dialogue about instructional improvement and the connection between SLOs, planning, and program review. A couple of faculty who attended January assessment and dialogue workshops spoke about their experience in the assessment process and in identification of improvements for their courses and programs. For example, a Language Arts faculty member recounted how he and his division chair, who also taught the same course, discussed their section-level assessment results and instructional improvements. He also noted that SLO assessment results would be discussed at their next Division meeting, where they would be reviewing the courses in the English sequence and considering additional improvements such as increased support from the writing lab and tutoring services. An Aviation faculty member reported how assessment results indicated that students were excelling in the written portion of the assessment, but not passing the oral section. He and a colleague discussed adding an assignment where students would develop and deliver a presentation to the class on a topic in the course. In addition, they are working with students to submit presentations at an industry conference so students can further practice and improve oral communication skills.

In spring 2013, instructors are completing the cycle by implementing the improvements identified. Where the improvements require changes to course outlines of record, they will be implemented in time for the summer session after approval by the Curriculum Committee. Where the changes can be done by the instructors alone, they are being implemented in the spring 2013 semester.
Program and Institutional SLOs

Assessment of programs is documented on the Program SLO Assessment Tool\textsuperscript{62} and in the Program Review process.\textsuperscript{63} Program Review questions include “What are the SLO assessment plans for the programs of the Discipline/Program/Service?” and “Describe the program SLO assessment, methods, outcomes, actions taken and planned, and if those actions require a resource request.”\textsuperscript{64} The environmental scan section of Program Review\textsuperscript{65} includes a review of the emerging trends in technology, the labor market, and community that affect the program. In addition, Course SLOs are mapped to Program SLOs and this mapping is included on each SLO Addendum. Comprehensive mapping of Program SLOs to Institutional SLOs will be completed by March 2013, so comprehensive assessments can be rolled up from Course SLO assessment data.

The Dean of Research and Planning and the Dean of Teaching and Learning are developing a module in the online Institutional Effectiveness System (IES) to capture and record SLO assessment. IES is the same system used for Program Review, so faculty and staff are familiar with the software. Through IES, the assessment information will form a much-needed database. The module is expected to be ready by April 2013.

To assess WLAC’s institutional SLOs, the SLO Committee partnered with the WLAC Student Poster Project Showcase that took place on May 15, 2012.\textsuperscript{66} Rubrics were applied to student capstone poster work to measure achievement of all nine institutional SLOs. Eleven faculty rated 83 posters with the Institutional SLO rubric. In addition, indirect assessment was conducted through questions related to institutional SLO achievement in the annual 2012 Graduate Survey. Students self-reported on how their abilities with respect to each of the institutional SLOs has changed based on their coursework and experiences at WLAC.\textsuperscript{67}

In support of continuous, robust campus-wide dialogue, the SLO Committee is also planning an SLO Symposium at WLAC to feature national and state SLO experts about SLO development and assessment. The tentative date for the symposium is April 2013. A faculty member has also submitted an application to attend the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy from March 2013 to January 2014.\textsuperscript{68}

Attaining Proficiency

The college recognizes that its significant progress on Course SLOs since the 2012 visit occurred over a short amount of time, and is not complete. It does set the stage for continuing work toward sustainable continuous quality improvement. The faculty and administration have committed to an ambitious work plan, and are carrying it out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Progress as of February 2013</th>
<th>Continuous Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Course SLOs in place for all courses.</td>
<td>All currently-taught courses have at least one Course SLO.</td>
<td>As course outlines are updated all will include a full set of overarching Course SLOs aligned with Course Outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Progress as of February 2013</th>
<th>Continuous Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Align Course SLOs with degree and certificate Program SLOs and Institutional SLOs</td>
<td>The SLO Addendum to the Course Outline of Record registers alignment.</td>
<td>Register alignment on the Course Outline of Record as new courses are introduced and existing courses are updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically assess all Course SLOs.</td>
<td>Faculty are assessing one or more Course SLOs for each fall 2012 course.</td>
<td>Faculty regularly assess one or more Course SLOs in each section taught; chairs rotate the SLOs assessed so that all are regularly assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically assess all Program and Institutional SLOs.</td>
<td>Institutional SLOs have been assessed through the 2012 Poster Project Showcase and through graduation surveys. Program Reviews document and analyze SLO assessment.</td>
<td>Continue to systematically assess Institutional and Program SLOs in capstone projects such as the Poster Project Showcase. Survey graduates yearly on Institutional SLO achievement. Roll up Course SLO assessment data to assess Program and Institutional SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the results of assessment at the course, discipline, division and college level.</td>
<td>Division meetings, Divisional Council, Student Services Council, Administrative Services Council agendas include discussion of assessment results. In completing program review, faculty, staff and administrators review assessment results.</td>
<td>Schedule events such as the SLO Symposium for review of the SLO Cycle and dialogue about assessment and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete, update and consult comprehensive reports on a regular basis.</td>
<td>SLO Assessment Tool reports are on file in Academic Affairs.</td>
<td>Deans are developing an outcomes assessment module in IES so assessment will be captured in a database, allowing for easier reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate appropriate resources in each yearly planning cycle.</td>
<td>The college has a 0.5 SLO Coordinator and a Dean of Teaching &amp; Learning responsible for the outcomes process, as well as three faculty SLO Leaders who assist colleagues in the outcomes cycle.</td>
<td>Additional SLO Leaders and an SLO Coach will be selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include dialogue on the results of assessment in decision-making.</td>
<td>Faculty report results of dialogue in the SLO Assessment Tool. They use these reports in division meetings to develop goals, action plans, and resource requests as a result of assessment, which are documented in Program review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal**  
Align college-wide practices, including the program review and planning process, to support and improve student learning.

**Progress as of February 2013**  
Program review includes questions about outcomes assessment results. Faculty and staff develop goals and action plans based on assessment results.

**Continuous Improvement**  
SLO module in IES will facilitate the completion of program review.

---

**Goal**  
Improve students awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

**Progress as of February 2013**  
Faculty include SLOs in syllabi distributed to students.

**Continuous Improvement**  
In conjunction with the ASO, the SLO Committee, will develop a student-friendly SLO website by March 2013.

---

**Goal**  
Evaluate and revise the entire outcomes cycle on a regular basis.

**Progress as of February 2013**  
Faculty and staff reflect and report on the outcomes process on the Outcomes Assessment Tools.

**Continuous Improvement**  
The evaluation cycle will also be outlined in the SLO Handbook that will be published by the SLO Committee in February 2013.

---

As part of the ACCJC College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation due on March 15, the college is reviewing its progress SLO implementation and conducting a self-assessment of each item on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III.

In order to respond to Recommendation 3, the college has identified Course SLOs based on course objectives and begun assessment for each course taught in fall 2012. Through established governance processes, the college developed and implemented an accelerated assessment cycle for 2012-2013, which has contributed to the great progress made to meet the recommendation. In the fall, faculty identified one or more Course SLO for each course being taught, and gathered the data needed to assess them. In late fall and winter, they assessed one or more SLOs for courses taught in the fall. Faculty discussed changes indicated by SLO assessments and are implementing those that did not require a change to the Course Outline of Record in spring 2013. This process is an accelerated version of the college’s three-semester cycle: semester 1 – teach and assess; semester 2 – dialogue and identify changes, semester 3 – implement changes based on assessment.

Moving forward, the SLO Committee will evaluate the SLO assessment process at its March 2013 meeting. The committee will review the process, discuss feedback from faculty as documented on the course SLO assessment tools, and consider resuming the established three-semester cycle, in which assessment of course SLOs will follow in fall 2013, dialogue and identification of changes in spring 2014, and implementation of change for courses taught in (fall 2013) in fall 2014. While the logical order of the assessment cycle would begin the process during the fall with implementation occurring the following fall, the three-semester cycle has flexibility. For example, some courses are only offered in the spring, so for those courses in
spring 2014, the cycle would begin then will implementation of changes based on assessment in spring 2015. This sustained improvement process ensures that course content, delivery mechanisms, assessment methods, and outcomes themselves are reviewed and assessed regularly to achieve the greatest degree of student learning and success.

West Los Angeles College is committed to moving forward and adding the depth and detail the Commission standards and SLO rubric require.

Please see also the response to Recommendation 2, for discussion of ongoing, systematic evaluation and improvement of all programs through program review; and the response to Recommendation 4 for discussion of outcomes in the services areas.

---
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RECOMMENDATION 4 – Student Learning And Service Level Outcomes (2012)

In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the college review and revise as necessary its developed student learning and service level outcomes to assure that they are measured in both quantitative and qualitative terms. These measures should be adequate for evaluating whether services are meeting identified student needs so that results can be used to improve the delivery of support services. (*Standards IB.3, IIB.4, IV.A.2.b., IV.B.4.*).

Introduction

As one way of assessing progress for achieving the goals of Student Services Strategic Plans discussed in response to Recommendation 1, West Los Angeles College’s Student Services Division has been assessing Service Level Outcomes, and a few Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) since 2007. In 2012, Student Services revised its process to assess Service Level Outcomes more systematically and to incorporate the assessments into its program review and planning cycle. In summer 2012, Student Services revised its Service Level Outcomes with the assistance of the SLO Coordinator and began a process that will assess all Student Services’ Service Level Outcomes over a three-year cycle, identifying needed changes, implementing them, and assessing both the changes and the cycle itself.

Establishing a System of Outcomes Assessment, 2007-2012

Student Services programs have used meaningful Service Level Outcome assessments over several cycles of program review. For example, in its 2007 program review, Admissions and Records had identified as a Critical Thinking and Planning outcome that students would be able to “carefully read and follow verbal and written directions,” established that the college could measure this by tracking “the percentage of complete and accurate applications and petitions,” and on the basis of the results of that measurement, decided it was necessary to “improve the clarity and visual appeal of A&R forms.” In its 2010 program review, Admissions, which had surveyed students on the Service Level Outcome, reported, “93% of students find our forms clear and easy to read.” In 2010, other student services programs put Service Level Outcome assessment plans in place that focused on planning and developing measurements or revising existing surveys.

Student Services developed an SLO matrix, which mapped Service Level Outcomes to WLAC’s Institutional SLOs. This matrix recorded each Service Level Outcome, how it was assessed, and an included an analysis of the assessment. In Student Services’ 2010 program review, some programs discussed the assessment of specific Service Level Outcomes and identified changes planned as a result, while others were at the stage of “planning to develop” measurements or to adjust existing assessment instruments.

Likewise, the Administrative Services Division of the College has followed the path carved by Academic Affairs and Student Services in developing and assessing outcomes. In Fall 2011, the units that comprise Administrative Services—Bookstore, Business Office, Plant Facilities, Information Technology, Personnel/Payroll, Purchasing, and Office of the Vice President for
Administrative Services—created Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and subsequently assessed them through online surveys.4

**Refining the Outcomes Cycle**

In 2012, the college took additional steps to improve its outcomes cycle by focusing on reviewing existing outcomes, revising assessment methods, and implementing the needed changes. Based on the recommendations, WLAC’s set about making these changes with particular emphasis on applying assessment measures that would better balance how the college measures the efficiency of Student Services. As new outcomes were developed, Student Services spent quality time considering both qualitative (surveys/self evaluation reports) and quantitative measures (data driven efficiency reports and student data) and the inclusion of criterion levels to benchmark improved services over time.5

Beginning in Summer 2012, to make its outcomes cycle more systematic, Student Services reviewed WLAC’s nine institutional SLOs and identified six Service Level Outcomes that could be qualitatively and quantitatively measured and that are applicable to all twelve Student Services Division programs. Then they revised all Student Services Service Level Outcomes to better map to those six Institutional SLOs. Each program has further narrowed the six Service Level Outcomes to measure the effectiveness of its operations. For each program, a set of specific Service Level Outcomes has been identified; each Service Level Outcome has been aligned with one of the six institutional SLOs, and a measure has been developed that can be quantitatively and quantitatively assessed for each.5 For example, the Technological Competence Service Level Outcome for Student Services reads, “Students will be able to access/navigate support services,” and each program has honed this Service Level Outcome to measure its own work in both qualitative and quantitative measures:

- Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS): As the result of using adaptive software in the high tech center, students will be able to access/navigate computer applications to complete assignments.
- Admissions and Records: As the result of Admissions and Records pushing the application exclusively online, students will access timely online support services.
- Outreach: As a result of participation in a field trip and subsequent individual/group advisement, students will be able to access/navigate support services.

Assessment of the Service Level Outcomes developed in each of the Student Services areas is designed to enable each area to evaluate how well it is meeting the student needs related to those Service Level Outcomes, and then to take appropriate action to improve its performance while delivering its services.

For example, the Financial Aid department may find that during peak periods they need to offer more assistance, based on findings in February 2013.

The Student Services Administration established a new three-year cycle of assessment:
Year 1: Assess Technological Competence and Civic Responsibility Service Level Outcomes at the program level. Identify and implement needed changes.

Year 2: Assess the changes made in year 1. Further, assess Ethics and Communication Service Level Outcomes at the program level. Identify and implement needed changes.

Year 3: Assess the changes made in year 2. Further, assess Critical Thinking and Self-Awareness/Interpersonal Service Level Outcome at the program level. Identify and implement needed changes.

The cycle continues with assessment of the changes implemented in year three, and a return to the two Service Level Outcomes assessed in year one.

Student Services recognizes the need to inaugurate the cycle in the current academic year and to use the results of assessment to make improvements either to the services, to the outcome itself, and/or to the assessment process. Admissions and Records, Athletics, DSPS, Financial Aid and International Students will be completing assessments for Technological Competence and Civic Responsibility of the five Student Services Service Level Outcomes by February 15, 2013 of the spring Semester. The DSPS department keeps data on students who use adaptive computers, and it uses the data to assess how many students are “able to access/navigate computer applications to complete assignments.” Also captured is the total or accumulated time students spend on these processes.\(^7\) The other seven departments will be completing assessments by March 13, 2013; they are the Associated Students Organization (ASO), Child Development Center, Counseling, Extended Opportunity Programs & Services, Matriculation Services, Outreach, and the Transfer Center).

Before the start of the 2013-2014 academic year, all Student Service programs will have developed instruments to assess the Ethics and Communications Service Level Outcomes. Assessment of the Technological Competence and Civic Responsibility Service Level Outcomes will have taken place in all programs, and divisional discussion of those assessments will have identified needed changes; paired with the changes will be assessments of them, also to be carried out in the 2013-2014 academic year. As each Service Level Outcome is assessed at the unit level, Student Services will use the results to inform regular, systematic discussion of Student Services’ overall achievement of identified divisional Student Learning Outcomes. There will be a regular review of the entire cycle of assessment, evaluation and decision-making. The quality review process will involve a collaboration of Student Services leaders from Student Services and the SLO Committee Chairs in May 2013.

SLO assessments are an important component of the annual Program Review. A principal purpose of SLO assessment is to identify areas for improvement and actions that will help achieve improvement. These assessment results are registered in Program Review, where they are aligned with college and program goals. Any needed resources are requested in Program Review, from which they enter the college fiscal prioritization and decision-making process.\(^8\)

In spring 2011, and continuing into fall 2012, Administrative Services participated in a series of SAO development workshops\(^9\) to address development and assessment of outcomes. These
workshops allowed the unit managers to discuss past findings and to collaborate on best practices. Other notable outcomes from these working sessions were the refinement of the already existing SAOs and assessment methods and the addition of criterion levels.

An SAO development workshop took place in December 2012 to finalize new SAOs that would better assess, both qualitatively and quantitatively, Administrative Services’ efficiency. At this workshop, division leaders were given an SAO supplement to document the SAO itself, the assessment method to be used, the effectiveness criterion to be used and their attention was called to a firm schedule of specific SAO work to be completed.

This process has yielded a new collection of SAOs, better in that they target operational effectiveness in more specific terms and are also more measurable in both quantitative and qualitative terms. An SAO Assessment Supplement Tool was developed to capture the SAO, assessment method, criterion level and target dates for completion of the outcomes cycle. These newly created SAOs will be assessed in spring 2013. There are questions in the spring 2013 campus climate survey specifically created for Administrative Services that are intended to assess these SAOs as well.

In early February 2013, the Office of the Vice President/Procurement completed an assessment for this outcome, “Purchase Orders created by Administrative Services will be processed in a timely manner.” The Office defines timely manner as “seven business days or less from creation to first printing for at least 90% of all Purchase Orders for the period analyzed.” After analyzing District reports, the Office found they had exceeded their established criterion level with 92% of purchase orders (reviewed within the sample period) processed in seven days or less. Based on these findings, the department will increase satisfactory turnaround time by reducing the number of days of electronic approvals. Turnaround time will now equal five business days or less from creation to first printing for at least 90% of all Purchase Orders for the period analyzed. Electronic approvals will be added to calendar twice per business week starting February 4, 2013.

In March 2013, the Business Office will assess two of its SAOs and has targeted April 15th as the date to begin implementing any changes that may be identified. Information Technology will assess two outcomes and will implement any needed improvements by the end of February 2013. Personnel and Payroll will assess one SAO by March 8th and have targeted March 15th as the date to begin implementing any changes that may be identified. Reprographics and Staff Services, Plant Facilities (Maintenance and Operations) will begin conducting assessments in spring 2013.

In addition, heightened attention was given to integrating the new SAOs with the unit program reviews that took place in fall 2012. In the future, this integration should yield a clearer, stronger connection between SAOs, program review and budget in support of West Los Angeles College’s refined approach to linking institutional planning and resource allocation.

---

2 Comprehensive Program Review, Part 1, Fall 2010:  
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/Part1StuServSLO1.pdf
3 Student Services SLOs: http://www.wlac.edu/slo/stud_svc_slos.html
4 Service Area Outcomes for Administrative Services Fall 2011:  
http://www.wlac.edu/slo/documents/West_SAOs.pdf
5 Student Services SLO Think Tank Minutes, June 26, 2012:  
6 Student Services Service Level Outcomes, Fall 2012:  
7 Student Services Service Level Outcomes, Fall 2012, DSPS, page 7:  
8 Program Review 2012-2013, Unit Goal and SLO Assessment, Administrative Services and Student Services:  
9 Service Area Outcomes Development Workshops:  
http://www.wlac.edu/slo/resources/index.html
10 SAO Assessment Supplement, 2012-2013:  
11 Administrative Services SAOs, Fall 2012:  
12 Completed Assessment, Office of the VP of Admin Services, Procurement:  
http://www.wlac.edu/slo/documents/ProcurementCompletedAssessmnt.pdf
13 2012-2013 Program Review Handbook:  
RECOMMENDATION 5 – College Catalog Currency (2012)

In order to fully meet the Standard, the college should include both an academic freedom statement, as well as a statement on the acceptance of transfer credit in its next catalog. (Standard II.B.2.a. & c.)

In an addendum to the 2010-2012 college catalog, the following language was posted on the college website in spring 2012:

**Academic Freedom**
The Board of Trustees reaffirms its commitment to academic freedom, but recognizes that academic freedom does not allow Prohibited Discrimination. The discussion of ideas, taboos, behavior or language which is an intrinsic part of the course content shall in no event constitute Prohibited Discrimination, though such ideas may cause some students discomfort. It is recognized that academic freedom insures the faculty’s right to teach and the student’s right to learn.

**Transfer Credit Policy**
Transfer credit for lower division courses taken at regionally accredited institutions of higher education in the United States is accepted toward Associate Degrees or Certificates. Students must provide official transcripts. Please have your school(s) mail them directly to our Graduation Office.

Students should make an appointment with a counselor for transcript evaluation.  

Under the direction of a dean in Academic Affairs, the recommended statements have been included in the 2012-2014 catalog, which has been available on the campus website since November 14, 2012. The printed catalog arrived on campus January 24, 2013 and was widely distributed.

Academic Affairs coordinates updates of the online version of the catalog with the catalog production team. The correction of errors follows established shared governance procedures, including Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate review, when necessary, with approval by the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Student Services. The full catalog remains online, as printed; approved corrections or changes are noted in an online addendum.

1 Addendum to catalog: [http://www.wlac.edu/academics/pdf/WLAC_10-12Catalog_Addenda.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/academics/pdf/WLAC_10-12Catalog_Addenda.pdf)

In order to address recommendations made by two previous visiting teams and to meet Standards, the college should develop a consistent, sustainable and sufficient funding stream to develop quantity, quality, depth, and currency in Library resources and services. Moreover, the college should take necessary steps to evaluate and correct security measures to protect the Library collection. *(Standard II.C.1, II.C.1.c., IV.A.2.b.)*

Recommendation 7 (2006): The college should address the inadequacy of its library collections. *(Standard II.C.1)*

Introduction

West Los Angeles College has identified means by which the library uses the program review processes (described in the response to Recommendation 2) to secure a consistent and sustainable funding stream sufficient to meet the needs of college programs. The college has increased library funding every year since 2009. Responding to the program review modules on Effectiveness Assessment and Continuous Quality Improvement and on Budget Reduction Planning added in the 2012 cycle, library faculty evaluated the impact of past years’ funding on the quantity, quality, and depth of its resources and services. They noted that a balance of print and digital resources and materials in the collection helps ensuring its currency. In response to the recommendation, the library developed a two-dimensional plan of its needs: first, the library’s the annual needs by students and faculty; second, the library’s 20-year plan to develop the collection. In program review they also generated resource requests that are being prioritized along with all other identified needs in the process described in response to Recommendation 2. Using the Library's Collection Development Policy, the library is able to meet the library needs of the college with a balanced approach that includes robust planning for budgetary changes and a rigorous presentation of library needs and successes to the college’s planning and budgeting committees.

2012-13 Library Support

College funds for library resources in 2012-13 include approximately $139,000, approximately a 9 percent increase over 2011-2012. In addition, the District has made a one-time allocation of $50,000, and a Proposition 20 allocation of approximately $195,000 is available for 2012-2013, which totals $384,000 for the fiscal year. This meets the needs for annual expenses and funds a portion of the 20-year collection development plan.

Planning, Program Review and Resource Allocation to Meet the Recommendation

To meet the 2012 accreditation team’s recommendation, the college has committed to fund the library’s identified needs through a rigorous application of the program review, planning and resource allocation process described in response to Recommendation 2. In its 2012-2013 program review,¹ the library reviewed past allocations and their effects, assessed the needs of the college, and planned to meet them.
The Dean responsible for the Library and Learning Resources Division validated the program review in the winter of 2013, including goals (with measurable outcomes) for assuring appropriate quantity, quality, depth and currency of library resources and services:

1. Maintain and update library instructional resources. (Measured in terms of the percentage of collection under 10 years of age, faculty and student satisfaction surveys.)
2. Improve access to library services for students. (Measured through student satisfaction surveys.)

These goals link to actions, some of which lead to specific resource requests, including:

1. Funding for instructional media.
2. Hire library faculty and staff.
3. Eliminate the gap between mezzanine and library wall; add electronic access control to key storage areas; add security cameras.

Before the program review was validated, the college had already contracted work to close the gap with a new library wall. Funded by a special allocation from the District, it was completed over winter break. The remaining security items, estimated at $10,000, will enter the annual prioritization process.

The library’s request for instructional media for 2013-2014 is $367,000. This includes approximately $180,000 for annual and on-going costs to meet current student and faculty needs for database subscriptions, and it includes approximately $150,000 for a 20-year collection development plan. Information supporting this request includes:

- Surveys of students and faculty
- Discussions of a faculty and staff–driven advisory committee on budgets, effectiveness, and new and emerging library needs
- Usage statistics
- Sampling of Course Outlines of Record for suggested readings
- Reference desk Subject Shortage and Missing Title logs
- ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education
- Book lists prepared by academic division chairs and program managers.

The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee has scheduled a retreat March 8 to prioritize all resource requests except for faculty hires, using a rubric which weighs each request according to factors including:

- supporting the college mission or goals of college master plans
- safeguarding student equity
- responding to accreditation recommendations.

The quality of the program review accounts for almost half of the score.
In April the College Council will review the resulting list and make its recommendations to the college president, who will make the final decision on the priorities which will guide the preparation of the 2013-2014 budget. The District has provided a special $50,000 allocation for the college’s library collection development. On a parallel track, the Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization Committee reviews all requests for new faculty, and producing a list which the College President will follow in future hiring.

In keeping with the college’s continuous improvement model, the library has developed a system to prioritize its needs, which it uses to budget to fund the items that meet the greatest needs. It has a plan to assess and communicate the effects of its annual expenditures in terms of what was effective, and less effective, including analysis of the implications for areas of need that went underfunded or unfunded. Key data for this assessment are:

- Reference Desk logs of unfulfilled requests
- Instructor surveys
- Student surveys
- The Instructional Support: Services and Activities module of program review.

In annual program reviews the librarians report on the effects that funding has in meeting needs as well as on how not having the requested resource impacts planned program need. The library's continuous improvement cycle thus feeds into the college's process of program review-planning-budgeting for the next year in a sustained and continuous manner.

**Past Library Support**

In the 2010-2011 program review, librarians requested $150,000 (based on Title 5 CCR § 58724 benchmarks) to maintain and update print and electronic resources, and library resources were given the highest priority ranking for the 2011-2012 budget.

For many years, the state of California's Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) and California Community Colleges Block Grants provided most of the funds that WLAC used to purchase books, electronic resources, and technology for its library. The library staff focused their energies on making optimum use of the funds provided by state sources. After a significant decline in 2002-2003, state funding was generally stable until 2009-2010, when the state eliminated funding to individual libraries and the college experienced a major drop in overall library funding. The loss of state funding left the college without this source of support for the library's print and digital resources and for new and additional technology at the same time that the state was reducing the rest of the college’s operating budget. (Headcount, for example, dropped from 13,500 to about 10,000.) Since then, West Los Angeles College’s Revenue Enhancement Initiative has successfully obtained grants to support the library from specially funded sources. Between 2009 and (budget-projected) 2013, specially funded sources have covered 63% of the library’s budgets. Combined with resources from the college’s general funds, this has provided sustained and continuous funding for the library.

Funding for library resources has increased each year by more than 9 per cent per year since the state’s deep cuts in 2009:
## Library Services and Technology Developments

The library has achieved significant increases, and new developments, in technology. Fourteen computer stations were added in the division’s Learning Center. Twenty Apple Mac stations have been added to the Library Instructional Research Lab. Forty laptop computers were added to assist students while they work in the library. Six iPads were added to support students using eBooks and digital information and materials. The library added Wi-Fi services in 2010, and students have access to Wi-Fi printers. The library added a color printer to meet students’ needs for color graphics. The college opened a classroom training room on the fourth floor of the library to conduct new technology training for faculty.

Library services also include:

- library research courses, stable since 2009\(^1^5\)
- online reference, 24/7 since 2010, using an adjunct librarian\(^1^6\)
- instructional digital design studio\(^1^7\)
- staff presentations at Tech Fair\(^1^8\)

## Security Measures

In 2009-2011 the division chair requested and received the funding to install theft detection technology at the major exits of the library. This system was connected to Radio Frequency Detection technology in the library's print collection. Once this technology was installed, a striking circular internal staircase could be opened, making it possible for students to move...
between the two floors of the library as well as the learning center below it. Opening these doors was a significant achievement fulfilling the vision of making library services available to learning center students (and vice versa). An additional benefit of the new security system was the opportunity to open an additional seven study rooms in the learning center.

To further enhance security for the library, an architectural flaw has been removed. Midway up the circular staircase as it connects the main floor of the library (2nd floor) to the main shelving floor (3rd floor), a mezzanine provides comfortable seating and casual reading materials, especially paperback novels. As the visiting team observed, this attractive architectural feature created a gap in library security, as a book dropped over the railing of the seating area could fall into the lobby outside the library.

In consultation with library staff, plant facilities personnel designed an upgrade to the wall separating the 2nd floor of the library from the 2nd floor lobby. By moving the wall into the lobby, they aligned it with the walls of the balcony above the mezzanine, eliminating the security gap. This project was finished over winter break in 2013. As a result of these actions, the college is confident that the security of the library’s resources and materials collection will be improved.

8 ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education: http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardslibraries
9 Book List Sample, Language Arts:


11 Board Minutes, Oct. 17, 2013:

12 Collection Development Statement:

13 Program Review Part 2: Linking Planning to Budget, Fall 2010, pp. 127-128:
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/PRActionResourceReq1.pdf

14 Program Review 2012 Report, Instructional Support:
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/Instructional-Support.pdf

15 Sample of Library Science courses: http://www.wlac.edu/library/info/classes_library.html

16 QuestionPoint Live Online Reference:
http://www.questionpoint.org/crs/servlet/org.oclc.admin.BuildForm?&page=frame&institution=13266&type=2&language=1

17 Instructional Media Center: http://www.wlac.edu/library/imc/

18 Tech Fair Fall 2012 Schedule, with library staff presentations pp. 4-6, 8-9, 19, and 21-22:
RECOMMENDATION 7 – Financial Resources (2012)

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college integrate planning, evaluation, and resource allocation decision making in order to systematically assess the effective use of its financial resources and use the results of the evaluation as the basis for institutional improvement and effectiveness in a manner that assures financial stability for the institution. (Standard III.D.1. and III.D.3.)

Introduction

West Los Angeles College (WLAC) operates in a financially responsible manner, reflected in the college’s ability to balance its budget or come very close, even in a difficult financial climate. The college has recognized the need to strengthen its processes to systematically assess the effective use of its financial resources and use the results of the evaluation to improve the institution. Starting in 2013, the Budget Committee and the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee will hold two meetings a year, one to focus on evaluating the effectiveness of resource allocations, and the other to evaluate the planning, evaluation and resource allocation process.

A Record of Fiscal Responsibility

WLAC has demonstrated its ability to assure financial stability via systematic, collegial financial planning in lean years and fat. For the 2006 and 2007 fiscal years, transparent processes involved college leadership in directing funds towards enrollment growth and implementing the college Educational Master Plan. FTES for 2006-2007 increased by 13.3 over the previous year; for 2007-2008, by 8.9 percent; and for 2008-2009, by 13 percent. When budgets were reduced for the fiscal years from 2008 to 2013 the college used its governance and planning processes to make similarly thoughtful, data-based, widely-understood and judicious cuts, often on very short notice. The Enrollment Management Plan guided the Enrollment Management Committee in reducing class offerings while achieving some enrollment growth through increased class sizes. The single budget deficit was in fiscal year 2009, when the cuts occurred in the middle of the year already underway.

WLAC is able to balance its budget, with the exception noted, through the use of regular monitoring and adjustments to expenditures to adjust to shifting fiscal conditions throughout each fiscal year. The major tools used include:

- Quarterly budget reports
- Monthly budget updates that include coordination between Administrative Services and Academic Affairs regarding the cost of instruction
- Quarterly budget meetings between college staff (president, vice presidents, budget manager, researcher, other deans) and district staff (Chief Financial Officer, Director of Budget and Management Analysis, head of attendance accounting unit) to review and discuss FTES and budget issues. District staff present issues of concern for discussion.
- Budget/expenditure updates presented by the Vice President of Administrative Services to the Budget Committee monthly.
The Budget Committee is a participatory governance committee which reports to the College Council. The monthly budgets and expenditure reports provide an opportunity for college-wide dialogue to occur about budgetary issues that arise, and to provide direction when choices must be made.

The budget preparation process, under the leadership of the Vice President of Administrative Services, incorporates priorities developed through the program review/resource request prioritization process described in the response to Recommendation 2.

**Honing Evaluation**

As noted in the response to Recommendation 2, the PIE Committee and the Budget Committee held a joint meeting to evaluate the effectiveness of 2011-2012 expenditures (and those of the 2012-2013 fiscal year for which data would be available) for February 28, 2013. In preparation, the PIE Committee reviewed reports generated by the Institutional Effectiveness System (described in the response to Recommendation 2) on the impact of receiving or not receiving requested resources; on the impact of a hypothetical 5% budget cut; on assessment of progress on prior goals; and on new unit goals.  

The PIE and Budget Committees have scheduled the annual evaluation of the college’s processes for program review and resource allocation for July 2013. It is already clear that in the subsequent program review and planning cycles (beginning in fall 2013), the rubrics for validation and resource allocation prioritization must be available at the beginning of the program review cycle to help guide program review authors, and that a more seamless interface is required between the program review reports and the validation questions.

As noted under Recommendation 2, the college has refined its program review and planning processes and is using them for 2013-2014 fiscal year planning as well as to assess the results of the 2012-2013 fiscal plan. In keeping with the principle of continuous improvement, the college has recognized the usefulness of more data and better information on the effects of both increased and reduced expenditures. For the fall 2012 program review process, PIE Committee revised the program review instrument to that end. New topics addressed included:

- The effect of past allocations
- The effect of unfunded requests in the past
- The expected effect of a hypothetical resource reduction.

WLAC piloted a new web-based program review instrument, IES (Institutional Effectiveness System), in fall 2012. Of particular importance in integrating planning and resource allocation is the feature which guides authors in linking proposed actions to college and program goals and to resource requests. New data supported informed responses to the questions addressing the new topics. For the first time, a report of expenditures and budget over a period of three years was provided. Submission deadlines were extended to allow more time for thoughtful, comprehensive analysis as program review managers and team members realized that they
wanted to provide more detailed and complete responses.

The PIE Committee began a discussion of the responses to these questions at its meeting on January 23, 2013, basing the dialogue on reports generated from the program review data, and posted online. Divisions and departments offered thoughtful comments in response to the questions, “What would your Division/Department cut if there were a required 5% budget reduction? How do you use college vision, mission and goals, and Division/Department goals to inform the decision?” The response of Child Development/Family & Consumer Studies provides an illustration:

We have been down this road for the past 4 years. We have had reductions from 32 sections of CD [Child Development] classes a semester to 17 class sections. We have been facing the reduction with fighting for every course we could hold on to. We have therefore created a mapping schedule that will help us keep our heads above water. We have no intention of letting our program become dysfunctional and irrelevant. What we have put in place to protect our class offerings is to move towards more online-hybrid and short term class offerings so that as the student matriculates through the program and is taking upper level courses, the courses are more accessible. If in fact the college vision is to be “A gateway to success for every student”, then we support that with our creativity and [flexibility]. We support that with re-designing our course offerings and the number of sections we offer of one course. At the same time we are careful not to close the door to students in the entry level courses so that they can have a solid foundation.

Responding to a question about the impact of not receiving requested resources, Information Technology, based on Help Desk, Network usage, and system downtime records, reported the impact of insufficient funding; “System Crash often, More stress, difficulty for technical problem solving, troubleshoot procedure and slow network traffic. Not up-to-date Technology.”

Results such as these will be summarized and form part of the data to be discussed at the Joint Budget/PIE Committee meeting on February 21, 2013.

The validation stage of the program review process was also strengthened, in part to promote better analysis of resource needs. In previous cycles, a dean and/or vice president would read the program reviews from those he or she supervised, and decide whether they were adequate. This year, deans and vice presidents worked in teams on the validation, using a newly-developed set of focused validation questions which guided the validators in considering the accuracy of information and the depth of analysis and elicited validator comments. Of 50 completed program reviews, 23 were returned for further information or analysis, frequently refinement of concepts crucial to the integration of planning for the effective use of financial resources. For example, the matriculation program authors were asked to clarify the relationship between service level outcomes and staffing and to make resource requests for staffing more explicit; language arts needed to link goals, actions and resource requests; and plant facilities was asked to clarify the relationship between its resource requests and its service outcomes. The Extended Opportunity Programs & Services program review was returned for more detail and evidence, as summarized in this table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Validation Status</th>
<th>Reason for Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the trends in FTEF. What are the implications for your program?</td>
<td>The program recognizes its significant role to the college on the number of FTEF it contributes to the college.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Please include a statement of staffing needs based on the number of student currently served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has the Office / Program / Service done regarding implementation of accreditation recommendations?</td>
<td>We are in the process of resuming advisory board meetings,</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Please list the date of the next advisory board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would your Division/Department cut if there were a required 5% budget reduction? How do you use college vision, mission and goals, and Division/Department goals to inform the decision?</td>
<td>Using the college mission, vision, and goals - a 5% reduction would impact the discretionary items that do not impact student success. For example, supplies, new technology, and extended hours of operation.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Please give examples of discretionary items (i.e., supplies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the Office / Program / Service addressed the recommendations from the previous program review? Address each recommendation separately.</td>
<td>The only recommendation from the last program review was to extend the advisory committee. The advisory committee will be adding members from the feeder high schools and the community.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>When will this be done and please provide list of advisory committee members?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This enhanced validation process proved challenging, such that deadlines for completion had to be extended. While validation was still in progress, the Office of Planning and Research used the IES to generate preliminary reports drawing from unvalidated program reviews. A compendium of reported facilities needs supported preparation of the space needs assessment under the direction of the Facilities Committee. Responses to questions about resource needs and college and unit goals helped the PIE Committee to plan for the process of prioritizing resource requests and to begin to evaluate the usefulness of the questions themselves.

All requests for new resources must originate in program reviews. In devising a rubric to use in prioritizing resource requests, the PIE Committee reviewed the 2011 Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services, and the College Council revised them. Based on the new priorities, the committee developed a prioritization rubric in its January and February 2013 meetings. In this rubric, requests for new resources undergo review in two stages. First, a decision tree for requests that respond to health and safety issues, or to legal requirements, helps identify requests which should receive top priority. Requests which do not rise to that level are then
scored on a rubric that considers:

- core mission/institutional learning outcomes
- college master plan goals
- accreditation support
- institutional effectiveness improvement based on data and evaluation
- student equity
- alternative funding opportunities
- link to a planned action and a unit goal in program review
- documented measures of progress towards a goal in program review
- responsiveness to Student Learning Outcomes assessments, as noted in program review
- responsiveness to other needs identified in program review
- adequacy of implementation plan in program review
- appropriateness of requested funding.

This rubric intentionally gives considerable weight to the quality of the program review from which the resource request originates.

The college is committed to continue using its cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, and plan implementation and has charged the PIE Committee with overseeing the following commitments:15

- aligning all the college’s plans with a revised Educational Master Plan
- strengthening information collection and dissemination, such as Program Review
- aligning resource allocation decisions with assessment, program review, and planning
- assessing our levels of achievement
- documenting progress on implementation matrices using measurable outcomes
- assessing effectiveness in the use of financial resources, consistent with financial stability
- engaging in college-wide dialogue on plans and measurable outcomes
- using results to make decisions leading to institutional improvement.

In overseeing these commitments, the PIE Committee works with other committees in West Los Angeles College’s established shared governance system.

---

1 Statement of 2008-09 Goals for West Los Angeles College: [http://www.wlac.edu/EMT/CollegeEMGoals%202008-09.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/EMT/CollegeEMGoals%202008-09.pdf)
2 Los Angeles Community College District Final Budget 2012-2013, p. 221: [http://laccd.edu/budget/documents/2012-2013FinalBudget.pdf](http://laccd.edu/budget/documents/2012-2013FinalBudget.pdf)
3 See Budget Committee Minutes: [http://www.wlac.edu/budget/agendasandminutes.html](http://www.wlac.edu/budget/agendasandminutes.html)
8 PIE Committee Minutes: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee.html Program Review Reports: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr1213-Reports.html
11 Program review reports: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr1213-Reports.html
Facilities Committee Minutes, December 12, 2012: http://www.wlac.edu/bpmc/bpmc_minutes/Facilities%20Minutes%202012-12-3%20FINAL.pdf
Facilities Committee Minutes, January 28, 2013: http://www.wlac.edu/bpmc/bpmc_agenda/Facilities%20Minutes%202013-1-28_FINAL.pdf
15 PIE Committee Purpose, Responsibilities and Membership: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/PIECommitteePurposeMembership.pdf
DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 1

In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend that the District actively and regularly review the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the progress in the planned lifting of the moratorium to ensure the financial integrity of the bond programs, and the educational quality of its institutions as affected by the delays of the planned facilities projects (III.B.1.a; IID.2.a; IVB.1.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

This recommendation calls for the LACCD to improve the effectiveness of its bond oversight structure through regular reviews, ensure fiscal integrity in the program, and address the impact of the moratorium on new buildings that are needed to support student learning programs and services.

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation:

The District has taken a number of actions to improve its bond oversight structure, strengthen compliance, and address issues related to the moratorium. Most notable of all of the actions taken was Chancellor Daniel LaVista's formation of an Independent Review Panel. The charge given to the Panel was to review the LACCD Building Program and provide recommendations on a variety of topics including the Building Program's operations, controls, checks and balances, policies, practices and procedures. The Independent Review, made up of prominent local construction industry and business community experts, included:

- Frederick E. Harris, Assistant Vice Chancellor, College Finance & Facilities Planning for the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office with responsibilities for capital outlay policy development and allocation of state general obligation bonds for construction at all 72 community college districts statewide.
- John P. Dacey, Esq., Senior Partner, Bergman & Dacey, Inc., legal counsel to numerous public entities throughout the state practicing predominately in the area of public works construction litigation and preventative risk counseling. His primary focus is complex construction problem solving. His clients routinely build over $2 billion in construction volume each year.
- Gary Lee Moore, City Engineer for the City of Los Angeles, responsible for design and construction of all public facilities, (for example, fire stations, libraries and projects involving parks, wastewater treatment plans) and the regulation of private development affecting the public right-of-way.
- Roberto Barragan, President, Valley Economic Development Center, manages the largest business development non-profit organization in Southern California, serving businesses with financing, training, and direct business assistance.
- Jim Cowell, Associate Vice President for Facilities, California Institute of Technology, with responsibility for campus facilities, utilities, capital construction and sustainability; former Deputy Chief Facilities Executive for New Construction at Los Angeles Unified School District.
- Karen Hathaway, President and Managing Partner, LAACO, Ltd, and 2012 Chair of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors.
- **Robbie Hunter**, Executive Secretary, Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council, representing 140,000 members from 15 construction trades and 42 affiliated Craft Local Unions. Licensed Construction Structural Inspector.
- **Sarah Meeker Jensen**, AIA, Founding Partner and President, Jensen and Partners, former Vice President of Engineering and Operations at AMGEN, and former Assistant Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences Design and Construction, UCLA.
- **Rita Robinson**, Deputy CEO, County of Los Angeles, for budget, finance and facilities asset management and development; former General Manager of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

Specifically, the Chancellor asked the Independent Review Panel to address the following areas of concern:

I. **Ethics**
   - Determine whether ethical regulations are sufficient to prevent the exercise of inappropriate influence.

II. **Cost Containment**
   - Evaluate both (1) overall hard and soft cost ratios, and (2) overall compensation for major types of Program contractors, vendors and professional service providers for comparison to programs of comparable size.
   - Review the effectiveness of the planning process and the adherence to the resulting plans, including change orders and their justifications at any phase, including the energy program.
   - Review the effectiveness and efficiency of the College Project Managers' and Program Managers’ support regarding the quality of design documents. Evaluate need for additional, cost-effective measures. Consider the volume of accepted change orders and assess the supporting rationale(s).

III. **Education and Communication**
   - Review the effectiveness of the type and manner in which technical expertise is provided to decision-makers in the implementation of the Program.
   - Review the communications and internal education systems between the Program Manager and the College Project Managers, between the colleges and the District Office, and between industry experts and campus-based staff, faculty and students to promote understanding of policies and procedures.

IV. **Effectiveness**
   - Evaluate whether the current organizational structure and procedures strike the right balance of authority at the colleges (Presidents, governance participants and College Project Managers) and the District (Chancellor, District department designees and Program Manager) for key decisions and milestones. Consider organizational changes and their appropriateness at various stages of the Program.
   - Assess whether major decision-making is sufficiently supported by quality documentation.
• Determine whether the distribution of resources and authority for the Program Manager and nine College Project Managers is appropriate and cost-effective.
• Review the effectiveness of construction management, inspection, commissioning and warranty enforcement on the compliance and performance of construction contractors.

On January 4, 2012, the Independent Review Panel issued a report on the District’s Building Program.\(^2\) Included in the report were the 17 recommendations that are listed below, with the actions taken by the Chancellor and Board in response to these recommendations to strengthen the Bond Program:

1. Impose a Moratorium on New Projects and Board Directives. The Panel recommended that the District impose a moratorium on all new construction projects that had not yet been awarded to permit the hiring of a new District Executive Director of Facilities. The Chancellor responded by issuing a short-term moratorium in December 2011 on $1.9 billion of projects that had not started or were not already in construction.\(^3\)

Since construction had not started, the moratorium allowed the District an opportunity to conduct a thorough evaluation to determine whether the following criteria had been met:

• The colleges could afford the costs of maintaining and operating the new buildings.
• There was sufficient capital to build projects with currently authorized funds.
• The facilities, some of which had been planned years ago, matched projected needs.

While the original intent of the moratorium was to provide the necessary time to analyze and appropriately adjust to the impacts of the State budget crisis, a number of other benefits have resulted from the moratorium review, including the following:

a. The colleges had a chance to take a hard look at the best use of remaining funds, which resulted in campuses making significant changes through shared governance to realign construction programs with current educational requirements and priorities.\(^4\)
b. The District’s operating budget allocation mechanism was amended to address concerns in ability to fund increased M&O costs and standardize minimum administration staffing.\(^5\)
c. Possible overbuilding at campuses that already had more lecture, laboratory, and office capacity than currently could be used were deferred or canceled.\(^6\)
d. Budget shortfalls for remaining college projects were identified and addressed before situations resulted from which the colleges could not recover.\(^7\)
e. A $160 million District bond reserve was established to appropriately address contractor defaults, claims, unforeseen conditions and other unbudgeted risks.\(^8\)
f. Bungalow and modular facility removals were made a priority to ensure movement of faculty and staff into permanent facilities.\(^9\)
g. A new facility database was created to provide a more timely and accurate classification of existing and planned new college facility types and sizes, as well as the projected need for facility space in relation to enrollment.\(^10\)
h. A deferred maintenance fund was established to address postponed and emergency facility repairs and maintenance work.\textsuperscript{11}

The Panel also recommended that the Board not issue directives regarding the Building program as had been done in past years. They noted that these directives caused significant confusion within the Building Program.\textsuperscript{12} Since receiving this recommendation,\textsuperscript{13} the Board has refrained from issuing any directives.

2. Modify the Building Program Management Structure to a More Centralized Model. The Panel reviewed the Building Program's management structure and recommended moving to a centralized management structure. The Board responded with Board Resolution BT4 which changed the bond management structure to a more centralized approach, leaving the College Presidents responsible for defining and ensuring appropriate responses to educational and programmatic needs, but transferring responsibility for managing and executing the design and construction to an industry best practice of having the College Program Manager report to the District's Executive Director of Facilities.\textsuperscript{14}

3. Program Cost at Completion and Program Reserve. The Panel noted that both project(s) and program contingencies must be maintained to the end of the Building Program until all obligations associated with the Building Program are addressed and resolved. Therefore, they recommended that an adequate program reserve be held at the central level to pay for anticipated and unanticipated costs. The Board responded with Board Resolution BT1 that sets aside $160 million for the risks associated with contractor claims, defaults, unforeseen conditions, and other unbudgeted costs.\textsuperscript{15}

4. Audit Update to Financial Reporting. Next, due to an Inspector General's Report dated September 20, 2011,\textsuperscript{16} the Panel recommended that the District Controller and the Program Manager perform and reconcile separate audits to ensure that all obligations and expenditures related to Proposition 39 bond funds are recorded in both the District and Build LACCD financial systems. As noted in the LACCD Audited Basic Financial Statements Report,\textsuperscript{17} in response to this recommendation the District developed a monthly reconciliation process. Since June 2012, the District has also provided additional training to ensure that these reconciliations are prepared in a timely manner and identified a dedicated employee responsible for this task. This requirement will allow the District to account for all of the Proposition 39 bond funds by the end of the program.

5. Change Orders: What the Data Suggests. The Panel also reviewed the District's Building Program change order data; this review revealed a few areas of concern. In particular the data highlighted a significant difference in how the District handles and manages changes dependent upon which of the two construction delivery methods the District uses to build a project—Design Bid Build or Design Build. In response, the Board passed a Board Resolution\textsuperscript{18} BT6 that "locks-in" baseline scope and budget at the project level for all remaining work at the colleges, versus the previous total college allocation. The Master Budget Plan\textsuperscript{19} also requires District level approvals for proper use of Prop A/AA and Measure J bond ballot measure funds, and changes in scope on college projects.

6. Proper Role of Shared Governance in the Building Program. One of the findings of the Independent Review Panel was that shared governance practices had significantly
contributed to increased costs, changes, delays, and disruptions to the Building Program. The Panel went on to recommend that the District establish policies and procedures to define the proper role of shared governance in the planning and pre-construction phases of all projects, and that the District should preclude shared governance involvement in Building Program issues after the Board of Trustees approves a project and a project's budget. The Board responded with Board Resolution BT4 that changed the bond program management structure to a more centralized approach.²⁰

7. Energy Program: Observations. With regard to the District's Energy Program, the Panel found that the goals were well founded but may have been too aggressive. The bottom line, the Panel concluded, was that the District paid too much for its solar photovoltaic program. Since many of the planned energy projects in the Building Program had not been started, the Panel recommended that the District put a hold on its Energy Program until the financial benefit and impact can be fully assessed, quantified, justified and understood. The Board responded by creating an Energy Program Ad Hoc Committee to review this recommendation and fully assess the District's Energy Program.²¹

8. District Wide Technology Initiatives. After reviewing a dashboard report, the Panel pointed out that the Technology District Wide Initiative was lagging with barely 10% of the projects awarded. It recommended that the Program Manager ensure that this portion of the Building Program be managed with the same rigor as the remainder of the Building Program. Since receiving the Independent Review Panel's report on this topic, the District has accelerated the release of District Wide Technology Initiatives as demonstrated in the most recent dashboard report.²²

9. Design Management. During the first six and a half years of the Building Program, the District engaged in a delivery method that is referred to as Design Bid Build for Prop A/AA Projects. Design Build was introduced as a new delivery option for most of the Measure J Projects. The Panel recommended that the District's Office of Inspector General audit Design Bid Build projects where there was a termination for convenience or work was performed under a settlement to avoid the 10% change limit; that District staff institute an evaluation of the architects involved in the Building Program; and that the Office of the Inspector General audit all current College Project Manager firms and compare the overall compensation for vendors in the Building Program, such as Architects, College Project Managers, Program Managers, etc. to that of other programs of comparable size. The OIG is currently performing an audit of the specific projects in which contracts have been terminated for convenience in order to avoid the 10% change order limit. The OIG performed a Market Survey of Program Management, Construction Management, and architectural services rates currently being paid in the local Los Angeles area in order to establish a basis for the rates currently utilized by LACCD in its PM and CPM contracts.²³

10. Construction Management. The College Project Managers should manage the construction process in such a manner that protects the owner's (i.e., the District's) interest. While the Panel concluded that many of the change orders had been owner driven, it drew the conclusion that the College Project Managers should have had better control of the change order process and alerted the Program Manager and District of the substantial changes being
made so that the District, at the central level, could have evaluated other possible options. Additionally, it recommended that the Inspector General do an audit regarding how such a large number of owner-driven change orders could have taken place and that she conduct an audit of all College Project Managers’ performance over the past four years.24

11. Hard vs. Soft Costs. The "hard" costs and "soft" costs associated with the Building Program, including overall costs for the major types of program contractors, vendors, and professional service providers, were reviewed and compared to building programs of comparable size. In general, the Panel found that the District's categorization of these costs was in line with traditional industry standards but was unable to benchmark them because they could not obtain comparable data from another large program of similar size in the time allowed. Given the Panel’s finding, no District action was required in this area.

12. Compliance with Proposition 39. State Controller John Chiang’s audit contended that over $140 million in Proposition 39 funds were not properly expended. The District took issue with several aspects of the audit. The Panel responded by stating that the District should implement more stringent policies and procedures regarding the expenditure of such funds to assist the Board of Trustees in meeting its obligation. In response, the Board revised a number of Board rules25 and administrative regulations26 and the OIG performed a review of Bond Program costs and services not allowable by Proposition 39 that included a reduction or elimination of several non-compliant Proposition activities, contract services, and staff positions.27

13. District Citizen’s Oversight Committee (DCOC). The DCOC was a key element in the bond initiative, but the Panel found, "While the current Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee appeared to be very forthright, dedicated, and concerned, the Committee, as a whole, has not performed and is not performing as it should." They recommended that there be a review and revision of the appointment criteria, that the District formalize the process and procedures for Committee activities, that they provide part time or full time dedicated staff as needed, and that they require and ensure more rigor in attendance. As a result of these recommendations, the DCOC has been fully staffed and augmented with new members from the construction industry, and the committee's by-laws have been updated to reflect these changes.28

14. Facilities Executive Director Position. This leadership role is essential in overseeing a $6 billion bond program. The Panel recommended that the new Executive Director be someone who has been successful in managing a program of similar or greater magnitude. In response to this recommendation, in March 2012 the District hired a new Executive Director of Facilities who met this criterion.29

15. The Building Program Manager. As the Building Program construction activity peaked in 2012, the Panel suggested that the new Building Program Manager should be someone who has skill at effectively closing and drawing down the program.30 Because the current Program Manager’s contract was set to expire in 2012, the Panel recommended that, if a new program management company is selected; key staff from the current Program Manager should be retained to ensure a coordinated transition.
16. Impact of New Facilities on Long Term Operating Budgets. The data shows that, at the conclusion of the Building Program, the number of square feet of buildings in the District that must be maintained will increase by 60% so the Panel recommended that the District address the Maintenance and Operations costs of the new buildings. In response, on June 13, 2012, the Board adopted BF4 that distributes M&O costs to the colleges. For FY 12/13, colleges will receive $54 million based on square footage. This amount will increase to $61.5 million by FY 15/16 and the Board of Trustees voted to create a Deferred Maintenance Fund by passing Board Resolution BT2. This resolution sets aside a fixed amount each year from the General Fund to address postponed and emergency repairs and maintenance work not funded by the Bond program.

17. Ethical Considerations. The final recommendation given to the District by the Panel was that the District institute mandatory training for District and College staff involved with the Building Program. Furthermore, they recommended that the District's Office of General Counsel review a compendium of Ethical Policies and Procedures from other community college districts to determine whether to expand upon the policies currently in place at the District. In response, the Ethical Policies and Procedures of other community college districts were reviewed and mandatory training was implemented.

Finally, additional actions that the Chancellor and Board took to resolve this recommendation include the following:

- **The Capital Construction Committee** of the full Board (seven Trustees) was created in lieu of the prior Infrastructure Committee that had just partial Board participation (three Trustees), to provide policy guidance, oversight of the bond program, and approval of master plans and environmental impact reports.
- **Dashboard Reports** are revised to reflect more accurate college project budgets and forecasts, based on the newly approved Master Budget Plan. Potential budget shortfalls for remaining college projects are identified and addressed to prevent negative results.
- **Board Ad Hoc Committees** were formed to consider additional policies to further strengthen oversight and control. The four Ad Hoc Committees of the Board of Trustees include: Building Program Review Panel, Program Manager Process Oversight, Asset Assessment, and Energy Program.
- **Independent Office of Inspector General and Whistleblower Program** created. A number of reports have been prepared that resulted in various policy and procedural improvements such as the Selection of Construction Contractors, Fulbright & Jaworski Memo Review of Proposition 39, Review of Bond Fund Reimbursables, the Selection of Professional Contract Services, and the Audit of the Change Order Management.

**Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date**

When this recommendation was received on July 2, 2012, the District was more than half way through 11 major District and Board actions to improve the bond program. Although the District was in the process of improving its bond oversight and the fiscal integrity of the program, the visiting team correctly identified areas that the District needed to work on to fully meet the...
Standards and Eligibility Requirements. The following is a summary of the results achieved to date and an analysis of the improvements and or benefits to the District:

**Independent Office of Inspector General and Whistleblower Program:** A number of reports have been prepared that resulted in various policy and procedural improvements as shown in the reports listed in the evidence files.

**Capital Construction Committee:** Provides policy guidance, oversight of the bond program, and approval of master plans and environmental impact reports. It has helped the District increase Proposition 39 compliance.

**Bond Program Panel Review:** Provided performance findings and improvement recommendations on the bond program, many of which have been implemented.

**Master Budget Plan:** “Locks in” baseline scope and budget at the project level for all remaining work at the colleges, versus the previous total college allocation. It also requires district level approvals for proper use of A/AA/J bond ballot measure funds and changes in scope on college projects. As a result, in 2011, 63 percent of change orders were a result of owner scope changes compared to 32 percent in 2012.

**Board Ad Hoc Committee:** Allows the Board to consider additional policies to strengthen oversight and control and therefore increased Board participation in Proposition 39 compliance.

**District Bond Reserve:** Ensures that the District will have enough funding to close out all Proposition A/AA and Measure J bond projects.

**Deferred Maintenance Funds:** Addresses concerns raised by the Independent Review Panel and State Controller's Office about the total cost of ownership for the building program.

**Amendment to District Operating Budget:** Addresses concerns raised about the ability of the District to fund Maintenance and Operations (M&O) costs for the new buildings.

**Management Centralization:** Addresses concerns about the proper role of shared governance in the building program.

**District Citizens' Oversight Committee:** Addresses concerns about the lack of expertise of members of the DCOC.

**Audit Update to Financial Reporting:** Addresses concerns that the District had not assigned a dedicated employee to conduct monthly reconciliations.

**Additional Plans**

The Board and District intend to continue implementing the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel and consider additional Ad Hoc Committee policies to strengthen
bond oversight and control. They also plan to increase the number of Independent Performance Auditor’s reports on the bond program.
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DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 2

In order to ensure the financial integrity of the District and the colleges, and to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend the resolution of the material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit be fully effected by the completion of next year’s audit, and appropriate systems be implemented and maintained to prevent future audit exceptions (III.D.2.a; IV.B.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

This recommendation calls for the District to resolve the material and significant deficiencies cited in the District's 2010 audit and ensure that the corrective actions taken show evidence of systematic integration to prevent recurrence of the cited deficiencies.

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation

In the 2010 audit, the Capital Assets and General Obligation Bond Program was identified as being a material weakness and Employee Benefits, Risk Management, and Information Technology were identified as being significant deficiencies. Listed below are the corrective actions taken by the District, together with evidence of a corrective action plan to prevent recurrences.

Capital Assets and General Obligation Bond Program Audit Findings:

- The District does not currently have adequate policies and procedures in place that allow it to identify and record capital asset expenses in the proper period in accordance with U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). Exceptions were noted during our capital asset test work, which required additional analysis by management.
- The District does not currently reconcile furniture and equipment purchased with bond proceeds to the actual equipment received and tagged.
- The District requires all employees designated in the Los Angeles Community College District Administrative Regulations as C-5 Categories and C-6 Designated Positions as having procurement oversight responsibility to annually submit a California Fair Political Practices Commission Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700) and the Board of Trustees Rule 14000, Conflict of Interest Code for the Los Angeles Community College District. However, we noted that there does not appear to be adequate controls in place to reconcile the information included in these forms with vendors or subcontractors utilized by the District.

Capital Assets and General Obligation Bond Program Corrective Actions Taken:

- Build LACCD, in collaboration with District Office staff, implemented monthly reviews and reconciliations of the Capital Assets and General Obligation Bond Program in fall 2011.
- Monthly reconciliation for bond budget reports and bank statements between LACCD and Build LACCD books is performed by District and Build LACCD staff.
• The District has planned three phases for improving the process of reconciling and reporting bond funded furniture, fixtures, and equipment: Phase 1 (Developing an Asset Management Strategy), Phase 2 (Radio Frequency Identification and Technology Solutions) and Phase 3 (Physical Inventory and Asset Tracing and Reconciliation).

• The District developed an electronic form that will cross reference information between the LACCD and Build LACCD.

Evidence of Systematic Integration to Prevent Recurrence:

• Policies and Procedures were developed and implemented for monthly reconciliation.¹
• Asset Management Strategic Plan was completed.²
• Physical Inventory and Asset Tracking and Reconciliation Project was completed.³
• E-filing of Form 700 software was purchased in January 2012; the look-up function is scheduled to be implemented in 2013.

Employee Benefits Audit Findings:

• There did not appear to be adequate controls in place to ensure that supporting documentation for check requisitions for medical-related employee benefit payments (i.e., payments made to Blue Shield, Kaiser Foundation, Safeguard Dental, and VSP) were reviewed and approved prior to payments. The supporting documentation was not included in one of the months selected for test work.

• There did not appear to be adequate controls in place to ensure that the reconciliation of the SAP Workbench reports of employee benefits expenses (e.g., medical-related benefits, retirement-related benefits, and other employee benefits) according to the payroll register agrees to the general ledger in a timely manner. During test work, the auditors noted that the information related to medical-related employee benefits that is transferred to the workbench files was not always complete and/or accurate. Errors are sometimes internally detected through a manual review of the data; however, due to the large volume of data, the District’s staff is unable to manually review the entire report. Errors are also sometimes detected by either the District’s health provider if they are either over or underpaid or by employees if they realize their medical claims are not being paid.

• There do not appear to be adequate controls in place to ensure that social security payments are made for all student workers and that all employees who work in excess of 1,000 hours are enrolled in CalPERS and Social Security. During fiscal year 2010, the District identified approximately 100 non-LACCD student workers to whom the District had not made Social Security payments. The District also identified approximately 200 employees whom it had not enrolled into CalPERS and Social Security in a timely manner. Additionally, the auditors noted exceptions in the test work related to Social Security payments (both over and understatements).

Employee Benefits Corrective Action Taken:

• As of January 2012, the reconciliation of billings was divided alphabetically and assigned to employees.
The Billing Manager schedules monthly meetings with employees to go over the reports. All variances are then addressed. Most of the variances are due to lag time of information that has not been updated by CalPERS.

Evidence of Systematic Integration to Prevent Recurrence:

- Printed copies of all CalPERS alphabetical reconciliation sheets for each month are made by each employee with their notes (corrections to SAP or CalPERS data) and reviewed and signed by the Vice President of Administration/Risk Management and Health Benefits. As part of the monthly review process, the previous month’s alphabetical reconciliation sheets are now compared to the current month’s, demonstrating the changes that have been effected and credits given.

Risk Management Audit Findings:

- There do not appear to be adequate controls in place to ensure the accuracy of the data that is submitted to the actuary used by the District to calculate the estimated worker’s compensation and general liability accruals.
- There do not appear to be adequate controls in place to ensure that the firm utilized by the District to process general liability claims is updated in a timely manner related to the status of pending cases related to claims the firm is processing.
- There do not appear to be adequate controls in place over the retention of supporting documentation related to claims being processed by the District’s third-party servicer. During the auditor’s test work, two cases were noted in which the District was unable to provide supporting documentation of the information provided to its third-party servicer for open cases.

Risk Management Corrective Actions Taken:

- For General Liability – On a monthly basis the Assistant Administrative Analyst reviews a sample of the Third Party Administrator’s monthly Loss Run of all Open Claims for general liability claims to be sure their data matches what exists in internal files. A signed and dated copy of this review is kept on file. Closed internal documentation files are moved to storage and maintained for three years per the retention policy established by the Board of Trustees.
- For Workers Compensation – The Workers Comp Specialist will review a sample of closed claims from the TPA’s monthly Loss Run to be sure their data files status matches the District’s internal records. On the last working day of each month a signed and dated copy of the review will be kept on file. Closed internal documentation files are moved to storage and retained for three years per the retention policy established by the Board of Trustees.

Evidence of Systematic Integration to Prevent Recurrence:

- Samples are taken every month from loss runs by the Workers Compensation Specialist and checked for status/updates. These reports are then reviewed and signed by the VP of Administrative Services/Risk Management and Health Benefits. The loss runs samples
are taken from the GL every month by the Insurance Claims Specialist and reviewed and signed by the VP of Administrative Services/Risk Management and Health Benefits. EPL (employment claims) samples are referred to General Counsel for their review, as these claims are not handled by Business Services. The yearly loss run totals prepared to go to vendor (Risk Services firm) are reviewed by the VP of Administrative Services/Risk Management and Health Benefits on a sample basis to ensure that the yearly final loss run has been updated; then these files are sent electronically to the actuarial firm.

Information Technology Corrective Action Taken:

- Security Weaver access control has been implemented for IT staff. Mercury Quality Center has also been implemented to record and process issues and application changes. Security Weaver Access Controls is used to monitor IT access for application support. For Basis Support – IT management oversight is provided by leads and the IT Basis Manager using audit reports and periodic reviews. The SAP Security Manager will conduct a complete review of access that falls under the IT domain and will make adjustments that are deemed appropriate to remove access that is not required based on business needs or where access is deemed appropriate to document the business need and establish a quarterly review to ensure that continued access is needed. The quarterly review was implemented at the end of March 2012. Furthermore, access to underlying databases and operating systems will be restricted to technical staff responsible for supporting these systems. Generic super user or system administrator accounts will be restricted and used only when unique users are unable to perform key system level functions.

Evidence of Systematic Integration to Prevent Recurrence:

- Quarterly reviews of security have been implemented. Accounts are reviewed on an ongoing basis. The next scheduled review will occur at the end of September 2013. Access to underlying databases and operating systems has been restricted to technical staff responsible for supporting these systems.

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date

The District has resolved every audit finding noted in the 2010 audit with the exception of the Capital Assets and General Obligation Bond Program, which was identified as a material weakness. Although not fully implemented, the District is making significant progress toward fully resolving this audit finding. For example, in the 2011-2012 Audited Basic Financial Statement prepared by our external auditors, KPMG, the Capital Assets and General Obligation Bond is now categorized as a significant deficiency (a less serious concern). The District is confident that with the additional plans listed below, it will fully implement solutions that will correct this remaining audit finding.
Additional Plans

The SAP IT Team, as part of its continuous improvement philosophy, was already implementing pre-audits. The Team has completed moving IT support access to Security Weaver and has moved all staff to the Security Weaver application for management oversight and reporting. HP Quality Center has and remains the key change management tool for tracking configuration and program changes and has been fully implemented across the SAP landscape. Workflow notifications regarding staff changes (new hires, terminations, etc.) are now part of the change management process and are forwarded to IT staff for confirmation and follow up. HP Quality Center continues to capture change management requests and activities as required. Super User Access has been removed where appropriate and SAP Basis and Security administrators have been moved to Security Weaver for management oversight and reporting. For non SAP administration management, an oversight process has been put in place to monitor access and review appropriateness.

In addition, IT management has implemented a quarterly review of all SAP administration access. Access to the underlying data base has been restricted to only those staff resources that are necessary to maintain the health of the systems. All other non-essential access has been removed. The SAP IT Team has staffed a full time Quality Assurance Coordinator to continue to emphasize its commitment to quality assurance. SAP IT Management is also implementing two new software tools that will continue to improve security by providing a quarterly recertification process for external staff and an employee password reset application that will significantly reduce the need to provide local password reset access to the campuses. Furthermore, the SAP IT Team will be implementing SAP’s Government Risk and Compliance application that will add additional check points around Access Control within the next 12 months.

5 Board Rules, Chapter VII, Article VII, 7706, page 8: http://laccd.edu/board_rules/documents/Ch.VII-ArticleVII.pdf
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DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 4

To fully respond to the recommendation first tendered by the Comprehensive Evaluation Team in 2006, and to reflect a realistic assessment of financial resources, financial stability, and the effectiveness of short- and long-term financial planning for the district and the colleges, and in order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend that the district adopt and fully implement as soon as is practicable an allocation model for its constituent colleges that addresses the size, economies of scale, and the stated mission of the individual colleges (IIID.1.b, IIID.1.c, IIID.2.c, IVB.3.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

This recommendation calls for the District to develop, adopt, and fully implement a resource allocation model that addresses size, economies of scale, and college missions.

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation

In the spring of 2006, the District engaged a third party consultant to review the District’s budget allocation mechanisms to assure that small colleges were not being negatively impacted. Studies were conducted to find out whether the model contained inherent disadvantages for the smaller colleges in the District. Among the findings were that the District should move quickly to bring its internal budget allocation formula into alignment with the provisions of SB 361, adjust the allocation model to make assessments on a cost-per-FTES basis, and consider a different way of conducting assessments. In response to this report, the District formed the District Budget Committee (DBC) Budget Allocation Task Force in October 2006, comprised of stakeholders from both the small and large colleges, to review the District’s allocation model.

The task force thoroughly discussed the findings contained in the independent studies and studied the impact of various draft allocation models. In January 2007, it issued its recommendations for a new budget allocation model which was then formally adopted by the DBC. The 2007 LACCD allocation model paralleled the state budget formula as provided for in SB 361, distributing funds to the colleges on a credit FTES basis with a two-tiered basis for noncredit. However, it differed from the state formula in one critical respect -- it increased the foundation grant for the District’s four smaller colleges (Los Angeles Harbor College, Los Angeles Mission College, Los Angeles Southwest College, and West Los Angeles College) by $500,000 per year. This augmentation of the basic $3,000,000 foundation grant was made in acknowledgement of the additional administrative expenses incurred by the smaller colleges.

The task force also recommended that District-wide assessments be changed from a percentage of college revenue over total District revenue to a cost per FTES basis, in order to make the system more equitable. The task force further suggested that the District office budget allocation not be set at a fixed percentage and that its budget be periodically reviewed.

The budgetary challenges of the smaller colleges were also addressed though the Allocation Grant process. In 2007, the Chancellor established the Allocation Grant Task Force (AGTF) to allow colleges to apply for financial relief. To apply for financial relief, the college submitted a fiscal self-study to assess the causes of its deficit. Members of the taskforce reviewed the data,
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visited the college, met with administrators, faculty, and staff, and issued recommendations to help the college reach financial independence. If the college followed these recommendations, a portion of the deficit was offset with funds from the District’s contingency reserve. Southwest College underwent the process in 2001-02, Harbor College in 2003-04, and Mission College in 2007.

In Spring 2007, the DBC decided that a college that ended the year in deficit for more than $500,000 or 1% of its budget (whichever is greater) would be required to submit a financial plan and participate in a quarterly review. To facilitate the review process, it was also decided to reconstitute the Allocation Grant Task Force as the Fiscal Policy and Review Committee (FPRC). With a broader charge than the original Allocation Grant Task Force, the FPRC began meeting monthly in July 2008 to address the situation of colleges that continue to experience budget difficulties and to consider new approaches for enhancing college fiscal stability.4

As the result of this committee’s efforts, detailed budget deficit reduction plans were developed for Harbor, Mission, Southwest, Trade-Technical and Valley Colleges. In addition, on January 7, 2008 the FPRC voted to augment the basic budget allocation formula for Los Angeles Trade-Technical College by the amount of $500,000 per year in recognition of the college’s historic career/technical education mission.

The allocation of resources is one of the District’s most challenging tasks. However, revisions made by the DBC to the allocation process in the past few years have created a more equitable and efficient system, and the District has continued to address this issue. In May 2011, the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC) began reviewing the District’s budget allocation formula, examining base allocations, the use of ending balance policy, assessments for Educational Services Center (ESC) operations, enrollment growth targets, and the college deficit repayment policy, in addition to reviewing thoroughly other multi-college district models. The result was a recommendation to amend the SB 361 allocation model to a new budget allocation model with minimum base funding.5 The new model has two phases:

- Phase I increases the colleges’ basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.

- Phase II calls for the ECDBC to study the remaining allocation agenda for allocation changes that identify college needs (including M&O), provide funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, and ensure that colleges are provided with sufficient funding to achieve their missions and maintain quality instruction and student services.

After vetting the proposed changes through the DBC and Chancellor’s Cabinet, the DBC approved the recommendations in March 2012, and sent them to the Board’s Finance and Audit Committee for review, the Board adopted the new budget allocation model in June 2012.6

Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date

In response to this recommendation, first given to the District in 2006, the District has implemented the following activities:

October 25, 2006 – Chancellor appointed the Budget Allocation Task Force to study and develop a new budget allocation funding model

October 2006 – January 2007 – Budget Allocation Task Force worked on budget allocation issues, reviewed suggested changes, made recommendations for a new Budget Allocation Model, and reported updates on the Task Force progress to the District Budget Committee

December 2006 – Received consultant review and analysis on the “Budget Management Issues Related to New Allocation Model” and the “Economy of Scale Analysis, Small Colleges” from Michael Hill

December 2006 – Budget Allocation Task Force issued the DRAFT Budget Task Force Report and vetted through the District Budget Committee and Chancellor’s Cabinet

January 2007 – Budget Allocation Task Force issued Final Report of the Budget Allocation Task Force recommending to the District Budget Committee to implement the new SB 361 Funding model

February 7, 2007 – Board adopted the new SB 361 Budget Allocation Model to be implemented beginning fiscal year 2006-07

2007-08 Chancellor established the Grant Allocation Application Task Force (AGTF) to allow colleges to apply for financial relief

May 8, 2007 – Budget Allocation task Force reviewed Trade-technical College’s Vocational high cost/high demand programs

November 19, 2007 – Trade-Tech College provided the High Cost Program Analysis to the Allocation Grant Task Force (AGTF).

March 30, 2008 – Budget Allocation Task Force issued recommendation to provide relief for Trade Technical College

June 12, 2008 – Changed AGTF to Fiscal Policy and Review Committee (FPRC) to continue review and study funding and allocation issues

August 2008 – FPRC requested Harbor, Mission, Southwest, Trade, Valley, and WLAC to submit their budget deficit plan for review

October 2008 – Colleges presented to the FPRC their budget deficit plans

October 15, 2008 – Chancellor appointed the Centralized Accounts Workgroup to review centralized functions and services

January 2009 – FPRC recommended funding growth over cap for colleges and provided relief to colleges with deficits.

February 18, 2009 – The Centralized Accounts Workgroup reported and made recommendations to the DBC for changes

July 2009 – CFO engaged consultant Larry Serot to review the District’s Resource Allocation Mechanism and small college operations

November 2009 – Larry Serot issued the “Analysis of Small Colleges and The Resources Allocation Mechanism”

March and April 2009 – FPRC reviewed Larry Serot’s report and recommendations

June –August 2010 – FPRC reviewed multi-district allocation models and Core indicators
- **August – November 2010** – Reviewed Use of Balance Policy and the current SB 361 Budget Allocation model
- **November 2010 – February 2011** – FPRC addressed fiscal year crisis due to the State Budget cuts and continued to review the Budget Allocation model
- **February 2011** – FPRC changed to Executive Committee of the DBC (ECDBC) and its roles were redefined
- **May 2011** – ECDBC established timeline to complete the budget allocation model review
- **June – July 2011** – ECDBC reviewed other multi-campus district budget allocation models (second time)
- **August 2011 – October 2011** – ECDBC proposed minimum base funding
- **November –December 2011** – Finalized the proposed new Budget Allocation changes
- **January 2012- March 2012** – Vetted the proposed Allocation changes through DBC and Chancellor’s Cabinet
- **June 13, 2012** – Board voted to adopt Amendment to the Budget Allocation Mechanism
- **June to present** – ECDBC studies alternative growth funding formulas in response to Phase 2 of the new budget allocation formula, which calls for a consideration of population density, participation rate, and other factors in determining growth funding.

The District Budget Committee is scheduled to evaluate the new model at the end of FY 2013 to see if the new plan is working to address the needs of the smaller colleges. Based on the annual evaluation, if needed, the District will develop a plan to modify the budget allocation model. Progress on Phase II will be reported on an ongoing basis to the District Budget Committee. Full implementation of the new budget allocation model is expected by December 2013.

---

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 5:

To meet the Standard, the Teams recommend that the Board of Trustees make visible, in behavior and in decision-making, their policy role and their responsibility to act as a whole in the public’s interest. Further, the Teams recommend continuing professional development for the Board of Trustees to ensure a fuller understanding of its role in policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the Chancellor or his designee.  (IVB.1.a)

This recommendation calls on the District’s governing board to understand their policy role, responsibility for acting as a whole in the public’s interest, and adherence to making sure that all communications with the staff involves the Chancellor or his designee.

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation

The Board’s formal policy on self-evaluation was adopted in 1995, and for 10 years, the Board used a checklist to evaluate its overall effectiveness. In June 2005, the Board amended its process, expanding to include, in addition, feedback from college presidents, District senior staff, and union and academic senate representatives, who regularly sit at the resource table during board meetings. Using this revised process, the Board conducts annual self-evaluations.

In 2007, the Board adopted a board rule to set goals as part of its annual self-evaluation. 1 To increase follow-through and accountability at the District level, in 2010 the Board adopted a District Effectiveness Review Cycle, which aligns annual Board and CEO goals with District Strategic Plan (DSP) goals. The annual cycle includes Board evaluation, Board retreats, college activities in support of goals, institutional effectiveness reports, and District effectiveness reports that align with the DSP. 2 At its retreats, the Board assesses District priorities and discusses processes for addressing them. 3

While new Board members participate in an orientation and all receive training on their roles, the evaluations conducted in January 2012 indicated that some trustees may have needed more training on their roles and responsibilities, results that led to this recommendation from the Commission in June 2012. 4

In order to improve performance, the District implemented a thorough program of professional development, with ongoing board development every year henceforth to measure improvement. Training was held at three retreats to help Board members distinguish their responsibilities from those of the Chancellor, understand their roles in setting policy, and develop goals and objectives to address items noted in their evaluation.

The first Board retreat was held on February 21, 2012 with William “Bill” McGinnis. Since 1992, McGinnis has been a trustee for the Butte Glenn Community College District. He has also conducted trustee trainings for 25 community college districts and served as an instructor for the Community College League of California’s new trustee orientation program. At the February Board training workshop, McGinnis reviewed data from the Board’s latest evaluation and discussed the role of the board as it pertains to governance. After a question and answer session
regarding the results of the Board of Trustee’s evaluation, the Board members discussed steps that they could take to ensure the Board remains an effective and well-functioning body.\(^5\)

The second Board retreat was held on April 19, 2012 with John Dacey who reviewed with the Board a document entitled “Successful Boards versus Unsuccessful Boards—A Brief Conceptual Overview.” John Dacey is legal counsel to numerous public entities throughout the state. At the workshop, Dacey helped the Board members understand the challenges to successful Board membership (constituency, consensus, and cooperation). He emphasized that successful boards have skills sets that are possessed by all good leaders (vision, communication and motivation) and that successful Boards understand that a leadership group is stronger together than alone; each member and the group must allow staff to “carry the water”; and the role of the Board is to set policy and make sure that it is successfully implemented by staff.\(^6\)

The third Board retreat was held on November 13, 2012 with Dr. John Nixon who was the eighth President/CEO of Mt. San Antonio College. Now retired, Dr. Nixon works with the ACCJC as an Associate Vice President focusing on Commission Policy and Training. During the retreat, Dr. Nixon reviewed key themes of the Board’s 2012 self-evaluation, discussed Board roles and their responsibility to act as a whole, and the importance of using the Chancellor as the board’s conduit for communication to the staff.\(^7\)

In January 2013, another self-evaluation was conducted to measure improvement. Overall responses to the 2013 survey were compared to those in 2012 to determine the areas in which there was an increase in measured commitment. The Administration and Finance areas of the survey had a relatively high proportion of items that exhibited a net increase in commitment. In the Administration section, five out of seven survey questions displayed increased commitment and in the Finance section, two out of three also displayed increased commitment. Based on these survey responses, there has been an increase in commitment in these areas of Board responsibility.\(^8\)

While the Administration and Finance areas showed an increase in commitment, the Community Relations and Education areas experienced the least improvement. Therefore, the Board will develop concrete action items to improve and will assess progress in the next evaluation.

Additionally, to reinforce the role of the Chancellor as the Board's conduit for communication to staff and to address the issue of Board behavior, all Board members completed the ACCJC's online accreditation training. Furthermore, Board Rule 2300.10 (Code of Ethical Conduct)\(^9\) and Board Rule 2105 (The Board of Trustees)\(^10\) were revised in December 2012 and approved on January 30, 2013 to include the following language:

I recognize that the Chancellor is the Trustees’ sole employee; I pledge to work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record.

Respect. As a Trustee, I will treat others with respect, even in disagreement, and to do my best to earn the respect of others. Being respectful requires civility and courtesy, as well
as tolerance for legitimate differences and a willingness to acknowledge that reasonable people can respectfully hold divergent views.

**Orientation.** Within budgetary limits, Trustees shall be encouraged to attend conferences and other educational sessions regarding their responsibilities as Trustees.\(^1\)

**Analysis of the Results Achieved to Date**

The 2013 Board of Trustees self-evaluation demonstrated improvement over the prior year. However, after three retreats, participation in the ACCJC online accreditation basics training, and a substantial improvement in the evaluation response rate, there are several areas that still need improvement. For example, concerns about inadequate preparation for meetings, trustee reliance on executive staff, and instances of micro-management were noted in the comments section of the survey.

Since the Board's self-evaluation was not concluded until February 6, 2013, a top priority of the Board will be to develop an actionable improvement plan that addresses the WASC standards and deficiencies that were noted in the evaluation. Meanwhile, the Board will continue to review its performance on an ongoing basis, commit to ongoing training and continuing education for trustees, and commit to supporting the Chancellor in the authority given to him to administer board policies and administrative procedures.

In March 2013, the Board will hold a special session to develop the actionable improvement plan. Discussion of the issues and evidence of the progress being made will occur at subsequent follow-up retreats. The Board acknowledges the deficiencies noted in the last evaluation and will openly address each of them.

---

9 Board Rule 2301.10, Article III, page 7: http://www.laccd.edu/board_rules/documents/Ch.II-ArticleIII.pdf
10 Board Rule 2105, Chapter II, Article I, page 5: http://www.laccd.edu/board_rules/documents/Ch.II-ArticleIII.pdf
11 Certificates of Completion for the ACCJC's Online Accreditation Basics Training for Trustee Candaele:
Trustee Field:
Trustee Svonkin:
**RECOMMENDATION 6 (2006)**

The college should periodically review its staffing priorities, hours of operations, and counseling priorities to ensure that what is delivered is consistent with program review, of acceptable quality, and aligns with the mission and values of the college. (*Standard II.B.1*)

All departments in the Student Services Division participate in the program review and planning cycle described in the response to Recommendation 2, ensuring an annual update to its self-assessment. The Vice President and Deans in Student Services validate Student Services program reviews together as a team, and collate all plans to assure that they are registered in updates to the Student Services Plan discussed in response to Recommendation 1. By systematically assessing its progress towards the goals defined in the Student Services Plan, the division tracks its progress in providing appropriate services to all students. Program review has helped the departments in Student Services take the time and reflect on past accomplishments and look toward the future, employing data on the number of students served, on their satisfaction with services, and on staffing. In program review, departments have identified specific needs, which have then been considered through the resource request prioritization process or, in the case of faculty positions, through FPIP.

Using this data-driven decision-making process, the college reached the decision to hire four full time counselors, a financial aid supervisor, a financial aid technician, and other admissions and records staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review</th>
<th>Allocation process</th>
<th>Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, DSPS, August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, August, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, August, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 and 2010</td>
<td>FPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Financial Aid Supervisor, July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Admissions and Records Data Management Specialist, November 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A key source of information have been reports from queue and appointment management systems. Since before 2006, the SARS Grid database has allowed the Counseling, Matriculation, DSPS, Transfer, and EOPS departments utilize to track student appointment and behaviors. In 2013, the Financial Aid and International Students Department began utilizing the SARS Grid program as well. The Nemo queuing system provided 2006-2007 data that guided the revision of Student Service hours. With the addition of evening hours for DSP&S and EOP&S in spring 2013, all departments in Student Services now offer services at the times when the data show students are most able to use them. Student Services areas open at 8:30am Monday through
Friday, and close at 5pm Mondays and Wednesdays, 7pm Tuesdays and Thursdays, and 2pm Fridays.

West Los Angeles College hires counselors through the colleges FPIP process. Through this process, the counseling department has grown, increasing availability for more student appointments and counseling related workshops. The most recent counselors hired are partially focused on providing group counseling and financial aid workshops which will in turn lead to students making appropriate career and major selections. In addition to providing general and transfer counseling, each counselor has a specialty, ensuring varied student needs are met. At least one counselor specializes in each of the following areas: financial aid, international students, career planning, veterans, athletics, EOP&S/Care, EOP&S/Puente, and DSP&S.

Through the use of technology, the counseling department has leveraged its visibility and availability to students.

- students connect with counselors via live chat for quick questions
- video conferencing counseling appointments are available
- advising is provided via email
- students sign up for counseling related workshops online
- Frequently Asked Questions are posted on the college website

Workshops, including those at the new Semester Kick-off days, broaden the reach of counselors. Counselors report that technology and the use of workshops have made their one-on-one time with students much more effective.

The college and the district are working with a software vendor to make DegreeWorks more useful. DegreeWorks maintains Student Educational Plans (SEPs) online, so that counselors can easily access them when meeting with students. The college is also exploring ways that students can also experiment with new directions in their studies by using a “what if?” function in DegreeWorks. To use this powerful tool, students must already have an SEP. The vendor and a district programmer are negotiating adjustments to DegreeWorks so that it can maintain unofficial, student-generated SEPs. Students would be able to explore possibilities on their own and make a record of their findings before meeting with a counselor to create an official SEP. Since new state regulations will give priority registration to students with SEPs in fall 2014, the target date for small-scale implementation of this new system is summer 2013. Full-scale use of this system in workshops tailored to specific student populations (e.g., first-time students, students on probation, DSP&S students) will enhance the counseling session and allow the counselor and student utilize their time more efficiently.

---

1 Link to echat counseling: [http://www.wlac.edu/counseling/counselor.html](http://www.wlac.edu/counseling/counselor.html)
RECOMMENDATION 13 (2006)

All college personnel should identify ways to increase participation in governance and develop trust throughout the institution by conducting meaningful, timely dialogue that acknowledges different perspectives and ideas for making informed decisions. (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a.)

Administration, faculty, staff and student leadership at West Los Angeles College are firmly committed to seeking the fullest possible participation in robust dialog and meaningful decision-making. The college governance structure offers opportunities for participation at all levels, and personnel from all parts of the college do take advantage of these opportunities.

College committees have representation from staff, students, faculty and administration. Most now have administrators as co-chairs. In addition to broadening participation, this often brings staff support to the committee. All full-time faculty serve on at least one committee and all divisions schedule meetings at least once a month. Adjunct faculty are invited to serve on committees and to attend division meetings, AFT meetings, and the Academic Senate. Many do, despite that fact that they are neither required, nor paid, to do so.

Committees actively seek broad participation. At the Fall 2012 Flex Day, faculty were provided an opportunity to indicate their interest in college committees. At each Academic Senate meeting during the 2012-2013, a division has scheduled time to present on their divisional best practices which sometimes includes information on their SLO outcomes. Plans are to extend the divisional presentations in each academic year with more of a focus on the discussion of interdisciplinary student learning outcomes. The Academic Senate developed and approved Mentoring Guidelines and Agreements that are being used with the probationary faculty hires of the Fall 2012 semester. In conjunction with the Dean of Teaching and Learning and the Academic Senate, West Connect was established as a venue to provide new faculty with events for interacting with other faculty, obtaining information and resources related to instructional strategies and workshops on sound pedagogical practices. These meetings have stressed the value of participating in shared governance, and all the new hires are actively serving on one or more committees. The Curriculum Committee has succeeded in maintaining faculty representatives from each academic division, including counseling and the library. The Technology Committee systematically reviewed the college structure to identify departments whose staff could play a major role in deliberations, and reached out to gain staff members on the committee. Staff from IT and Distance Education now provide crucial perspectives in the committee’s discussions.

The 2006 Self Study identified problems in effective committee communication. West Los Angeles College has recognized that a committee’s effectiveness has to be based upon the meaningful and sustainable participation of its members. The College Council has established the committee membership for each standing committee with each one having faculty and an administrator as co-chairs. Electronic or verbal monthly reports are given at each regular College Council meeting. The Academic Senate continues to get faculty to participate on both college and senate standing committees and other critical committees such as tenure review. Based on the faculty work load block forms, WLAC has achieved 100% compliance with the AFT Faculty Contract for each full time faculty to serve on at least one committee. Many agendas and minutes
are being posted on the appropriate college websites to help facilitate effective college-wide communication and information. The next area of concern to be addressed is the term limits of the members for each of the standing committees. In September 2012, many of the academic divisions began to use agenda templates which called for discussion of student success and Achieving the Dream, professional development sharing, curriculum and SLO dialogue. The Student Success Committee and the Achieving the Dream Core Team experimented with new models of interpersonal communications, such as having each member agree to speak to five colleagues on an issue the committee identified.

West Los Angeles College’s first Semester Kickoff in fall 2012 demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach. Eight students volunteered to help their peers, alongside 47 faculty, 10 administrators and 29 staff. Hundreds of students attended this activity, a day before classes started in which they could come and meet faculty and get acquainted with college services. Facilities staff served as greeters. A Kickoff for the spring semester took place on Feb. 1, 2013, with similar participation.

Furthermore, the Student Success Committee and the Achieving the Dream Core Team are exploring and promoting various professional development opportunities designed to stimulate collaboration and cross-campus communication: college’s annual Leadership Retreat, Reading Apprenticeship trainings and Faculty Inquiry Group, the LACCD Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy, WLAC’s Tech Fair workshops, the ACE program’s Experiential Learning Institute, and informal cross-campus social activities.

In spring 2011, West Los Angeles College conducted a Campus Climate Survey. The survey was designed to support decision-making, and provided data for program review. Under the auspices of the College Council and the Planning Committee, the survey was designed to gather both quantitative and qualitative measures. The survey responded to Recommendation 1 of the 2006 accreditation site visit: “The college should create a campus climate that embraces open, candid dialogue that embodies a culture of respect, civility and trust to improve institutional decision-making, planning and effectiveness.” During spring 2013, another Campus Climate Survey is being conducted. This new version will feature an additional section of questions geared toward the evaluation of administrative services, primarily for the purpose of evaluating administrative service area outcomes. Overall, there has been a significant increase in participation of faculty, staff, and administrators on college committees and townhalls. Students still tend to have sporadic participation, as do most community college students, due to class schedules and outside responsibilities.

1 Full-time Faculty Committee Participation:
http://www.wlac.edu/accreditation/2013followup/documentation/documentation_2006/recommendation13/Fulltime%20Faculty%20Committee%20Participation%202013.pdf
2 Academic Affairs webpage: http://www.wlac.edu/academicaffairs/divisionMtgs.html
3 Academic Senate webpage: http://www.wlac.edu/academicsenate/agendasandminutes.html
4 New Probationary Faculty Mentoring Guidelines, Fall 2012:
5 West Connect: [http://www.wlac.edu/professionaldevelopment/](http://www.wlac.edu/professionaldevelopment/)
6 Curriculum Committee Agendas and Minutes: [http://www.wlac.edu/curriculum/agendas_minutes.html](http://www.wlac.edu/curriculum/agendas_minutes.html)
7 Technology Committee Agendas and Minutes: [http://www.wlac.edu/technology/agendas_minutes.html](http://www.wlac.edu/technology/agendas_minutes.html)
14 Student Success Committee/ATD Core Team Agenda, March 7, 2012: [http://www.wlac.edu/studentsuccess/Student%20Success%20Committee-Core%20Team%20Agenda%203%207%202012.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/studentsuccess/Student%20Success%20Committee-Core%20Team%20Agenda%203%207%202012.pdf)
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25. SLO Assessment Tutorial
26. SLO Bulletin Fall 2012
27. SLO Bulletin Spring 2013
28. SLO Committee Minutes
29. SLO Course Assessment Cycle
30. SLO Course Assessment Tool, December 2012
31. SLO Course Assessment Tool, September 2011
32. SLO Handbook - Back to Basics: Course SLO Development
33. SLO Impact Flowchart
34. SLO Leader and Coach Announcement, December 2012
35. SLO News (Newsletter)
36. SLO Podcast
37. SLO Portfolio Project
38. SLO Website
39. SLO Website, Process Diagrams
40. SLO Website, Reports
41. SLO Workgroup Minutes
42. SLO Year in Review 2011-2012
43. Spring 2012 Graduate Survey, Institutional SLO Responses
44. Student Learning Outcomes Monthly Report, May 2012
45. The RP Group 2009 POWER Awards
46. Timeline for Draft Response to Rec. 3 and 4
47. WASC Assessment Leadership Academy Webpage

APPENDIX E: Recommendation 4 Evidence

1. 2012-2013 Program Review Handbook
2. Administrative Services SAOs Fall 2012
3. Completed Assessment, Office of the VP of Admin Services, Procurement
4. Comprehensive Program Review, Part 1, Fall 2010
5. Program Review 2012-2013, Unit Goal and SLO Assessment, Administrative Services and Student Services
7. SAO Assessment Supplement 2012-2013
8. Service Area Outcomes for Administrative Services Fall 2011
9. SLO Resources Website
10. Student Services Service Level Outcomes, Fall 2012
11. Student Services SLO Think Tank Minutes, June 26, 2012
12. Student Services SLOs

APPENDIX F: Recommendation 5 Evidence

1. Addendum to Catalog

APPENDIX G: Recommendation 6 Evidence

1. ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education
2. Board of Trustees Minutes, Oct. 17, 2013
3. Book List Sample, Language Arts
4. Collection Development Statement
5. Fall 2012 Faculty Evaluation of Library, Student Survey Results
6. Instructional Media Center
7. Library Advisory Committee Notes
8. Planning Report 2012-2013, Library
9. Prioritization Rubric
10. Program Review 2012-2013, Library
12. Program Review Part 2: Linking Planning to Budget, Fall 2010
13. QuestionPoint Live Online Reference Website
14. Reference Desk Subject Shortage and Missing Title Logs
15. Sample of Library Science Courses
16. Tech Fair Fall 2012 Schedule

APPENDIX H: Evidence, Recommendation 7

1. 2012-2013 Program Review Reports
2. Academic Division Expenditures
3. Budget Committee Minutes
5. Los Angeles Community College District Final Budget 2012-2013
6. PIE Committee Agenda, February 13, 2013
7. PIE Committee Minutes
8. PIE Committee Purpose, Responsibilities and Membership
10. Statement of 2008-09 Goals for West Los Angeles College
11. Validation Summary Report
APPENDIX I: District Recommendation 1 Evidence

1. Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, June 13, 2012
3. Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committees
4. Board of Trustees Administrative Regulations
5. Board of Trustees Minutes
6. Board of Trustees Rules
7. Build LACCD Dashboard Reports
8. Build LACCD Master Building Program Budget Plan
10. Bungalow, Modular and Old Building Demolition Lists
11. Email from Chancellor LaVista Announcing Building Program Moratorium, October 3, 2011
12. Facilities Database Report
15. LACCD Chancellor Announces Formation of Review Panel
17. Los Angeles City College Shared Governance Council Minutes
19. Moratorium Status November 2012
20. Moratorium Update to the Board of Trustees, August 22, 2012
22. Performance Audit of Bond Fund Management (Reimbursable Costs), February 20, 2012

APPENDIX J: District Recommendation 2 Evidence

1. Board Rule 7706 (Chapter VII, Article VII, page 8)
2. CalPERS Reconciliation with Billing Roster Report, May 2012
3. Closed Status Claim Disposition Report
4. Fixed Asset Inventory and Reconciliation Report, September 14, 2012
5. Monthly Bond Reconciliation Process
7. Strategic Asset Management Plan, February 18, 2011
APPENDIX K: Evidence, District Recommendation 4

1. Adoption of Allocation Model, February 7, 2007
2. Amendment to the Budget Allocation Mechanism, June 13, 2012
3. Budget Committee minutes, October 25, 2006
4. Operating Standards and Measures for Monitoring and Assessment of College Condition
6. Report to Chancellor Young on Specific Matters Related to District Operations, October 5, 2006

APPENDIX L: District Recommendation 5 Evidence

1. Board of Trustees Retreat Agenda, August 2011
2. Board of Trustees Rules
3. Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation, 2012-2013
4. Board of Trustees Special Meeting Agenda April 19, 2012
5. Board Special Meeting Agenda, November 13, 2012
6. Board of Trustees Training Workshop Agenda, February 21, 2012
7. Certificates of Completion for the ACCJC’s Online Accreditation Basics
8. District Effectiveness Review Cycle flow chart

APPENDIX M: Evidence, 2006 Recommendation 6

1. Website Link to echat Counseling

APPENDIX N: Evidence, 2006 Recommendation 13

1. Academic Affairs Webpage
2. Academic Division Agenda Template Example from Language Arts
3. Academic Senate Webpage
4. Annual Leadership Retreat; Pulling it All Together, Agenda
5. ATDetails
6. Curriculum Committee Agendas and Minutes
7. Full-time Faculty Committee Participation
8. New Probationary Faculty Mentoring Guidelines, Fall 2012
9. Student Success Committee and ATD Core Team Agenda March 7, 2012
10. Technology Committee Agendas and Minutes
11. West Connect