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Statement on Report Preparation

The Accreditation Steering Committee oversaw the preparation of the 2015 Midterm Report. Its co-chairs presented timelines for report production to the overarching shared governance body on campus, the College Council,1 and to administrative groups.2 The faculty co-chair presented timelines to the Academic Senate and the AFT Faculty Guild.3

The Committee maintained the organization used in preparing the 2013 Follow-Up Report, with one or two people serving as point persons for each for the recommendations of the 2012 Visiting Team.4 For each recommendation, a summary of progress on continued satisfaction of the recommendations was produced and discussed at meetings of the Steering Committee.5 The Committee oversaw the production of newsletters on planning and on SLO assessment.6 These served to remind the campus of the accreditation process and its expectations, to highlight the progress made in meeting standards, and to enhance campus discussion of the processes that had led to it.7
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The District Office of Institutional Effectiveness drafted the responses to the District Recommendations. The District Planning and Accreditation Committee provided training in the Standards and the kinds of evidence used to support them and provided a venue for the exchange of best practices among the nine Colleges.

Using the major claims that had been circulated through newsletters and in Accreditation Steering Committee Meetings, the faculty chair of the Committee developed a draft of the Midterm Report, which was distributed to the Committee on July 1 and reviewed at a July 28 meeting of the Committee. It was revised three times in August, and on August 21 the Steering Committee approved a draft, which was presented to the College Council on September 4 and updated September 8. The expectation was that the College Council and its constituent bodies (including the Academic Senate and collective bargaining units) would review it by October 13, so that any necessary changes could be incorporated into a final draft in time for constituent review and College Council approval at its early December meeting. The Board of Trustees Institutional Effectiveness Committee visited the campus on December 9 to discuss the report. The Board of Trustees scheduled presentation of the report for its February 11, 2015 meeting to ensure that the Report would be ready to submit by the Commission deadline in March. The Steering Committee planned to provide an update to cover developments after November 2014.

Evidence: Report Preparation
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Academic Senate Minutes, February 25, 2014, page 4:

Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes, August 21, 2014:

College Council Minutes September 4, 2014, Item 7:

Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes, September 8, 2014:

Board of Trustees Institutional Effectiveness & Student Success Committee Agenda for Special Meeting, December 9, 2014:
Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

INTRODUCTION
This Midterm Report documents that West Los Angeles College and the Los Angeles Community College District have sustained the improvements that brought the College and District into compliance with the Standards in 2013. For the convenience of the reader, the discussion of each recommendation begins with an overview briefly summarizing the steps taken to meet it before proceeding to a broader analysis that takes into account the underlying Standards.

In 2012, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) gave West Los Angeles College (WLAC) thirteen recommendations, including four pertaining particularly to the Los Angeles Community College District. Two were recommendations made in 2006, which the Commission noted had been “partially addressed.” In its April 2013 Evaluation Report, the Follow-Up External Evaluation Team addressed the nine College recommendations, concluding for each that “The College has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies and now is in compliance [for Recommendation 2, “in accord”] with Accreditation Standards and Commission policies.” For each of the four district recommendations, the team concluded, “The District has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now is in compliance with the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies.”
Recommendation 1

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. (Standard I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.4; IV.A.)

Recommendation 5 of 2006 read: 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.A.4, I.B.)

OVERVIEW

After its spring 2013 visit, the Follow-Up External Evaluation Team noted that the College had defined measures for its master plans and assessed the four plans: the Educational Master Plan (EMP), the Facilities Master Plan, the Technology Master Plan, and the Student Services Plan. At the time of the visit, the College was engaged in a thorough analysis of its planning and budgeting processes, and had determined that all the master plans needed major revision. Early in 2013, the process was envisaged as starting with a revision of the EMP, so that it could guide the other plans. The Student Services Plan has been subsumed into the new EMP. The Technology Committee resolved to begin a revision of the Technology Plan as soon as a new EMP is adopted.

The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee and the Academic Senate agreed that the EMP should be developed by a workgroup of the PIE Committee and the Senate’s Educational Standards and Policies Committee. The Workgroup had its first meeting in April 2013, and met through July 2014 to complete a draft EMP. The College Council, representing all College constituencies, approved the plan on October 2, 2014. The Board of Trustees will receive the plan at its meeting Dec. 17, 2014.

2013 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Logically, the revision of remaining Master Plans should have begun after the adoption of the new EMP, as is planned for the Technology Master Plan. However, District requirements for campus planning for bond-funded construction necessitated a thorough review of facilities needs and resources, so that the College modified the existing plan, and the Board of Trustees approved the 2013 Facilities Master Plan Update in January 2014. The creation of the Update was an intense exercise in the definition, gathering, and analysis of data. This process led organically to the formulation of strategies to meet
the College’s instructional and administrative space needs through 2026 while staying within the remaining budget from three Proposition 39 bond measures. The success of these strategies will be measured in quantitative as well as qualitative terms.

Two have black-and-white measures for success: “Eliminate Temporary Modular Buildings and 1969 Bungalow Buildings” and “Eliminate the Need for Swing Space.” Others depend on the data definitions established during the process of developing the plan. To “Remodel Under-Utilized or Inactive Spaces,” planners had to set utilization norms and evaluate data. To “Design within Budget and Prioritize Projects to Guard Against Contingencies,” planners have to track expenditures as the projects progress, bond funds are exhausted, and new funds are identified. The governance processes the College used to produce the Update are discussed in connection with Recommendation 13 of 2006.

EQUITY PLAN AND STUDENT SUCCESS AND SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The State Chancellor’s Office provides two templates for the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) plan and for the new Student Equity plan. The SSSP plan was due to the State Chancellor’s Office in October 2014. The Student Equity plan was due to the State Chancellor’s Office by January 2, 2015. The chancellor’s templates for these plans define the data to use in evaluating the achievements of each one.

The College created a shared governance structure for development and approval of these two plans. The name, charge and structure of the former Enrollment Management Committee were changed to reflect the work needed to develop both plans. The committee is now named the Student Equity, Access, and Completion (SEAC) Committee. SEAC has an SSSP Advisory Committee, named and structured following the recommendations of the State Chancellor’s Office. This committee developed the SSSP plan. SEAC also created a student equity workgroup to develop the Student Equity Plan. Both plans emphasize the importance of specific student success indicators and link planning with budget. Both plans are also linked with the Educational Master Plan (EMP).

EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN

The EMP specifies direct measures for all objectives. Most of the goals also have direct measures; four goals will be assessed by aggregating measures of the supporting objectives. The Institutional Effectiveness System (IES) will support evaluation of progress in reaching the EMP Strategic Goals. This approach will engage more of the College community, especially the “Point Persons,” in explicitly evaluating progress on EMP Objectives and Goals using both quantitative and qualitative measures. Evaluation of the EMP itself is part of the annual review process, in addition to evaluation of the achievement of Strategic Goals and Objectives.

The campus review of the EMP involved College-wide dialogue on plans and measurable outcomes, just as the dialogue on the Facilities Master Plan Update focused on the use of WLAC 2015 Midterm Report: Recommendation 1
data to determine the College’s most effective moves. Processes for the development and review of the EMP are discussed in connection with Recommendation 13 of 2006.

**Evidence: Recommendation 1**


8. Linda Michalowski, College Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs Division, California Community Chancellor’s Office, Memo on Updated Student Equity Plans, March 11, 2014, Attachment E, Sample Plan Template (condensed): [http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAcreditation/MidtermEvidence/SREPlanTemplate.docx](http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAcreditation/MidtermEvidence/SREPlanTemplate.docx)
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9 Draft Educational Master Plan, 2014-2020, pages 30-53:
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee/EMP_Pre-Draft_08-01-2014.pdf
Recommendation 2

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).

OVERVIEW
WLAC’s planning cycle has matured to the point where it is sustainable, supported by online information management, and involves informed discussion in multiple venues. Since spring 2012, the College has completed three cycles, planning for 2012-2013 (underway at the time of the comprehensive visit), for 2013-2014, and for 2014-15. Each of these cycles began with campus-wide program reviews which were validated before being used in resource allocation and budgeting. In fall 2012, the Planning and the Program Review Committees merged into a single Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee, which oversees these processes up to the point of prioritizing requests for new resources. The College Council receives the prioritization and has consistently recommended each prioritized list to the college president. With input from the Budget Committee, he allocates resources, taking into account the identified priorities. The Program Review Handbook documents the entire planning cycle.

In brief, the cycle consists of:
- Program Review and Unit Planning: All Programs and Divisions use an online instrument with embedded data (the Institutional Effectiveness System, or IES).\(^1\)
- Validation: Teams of administrators, staff, and faculty join in systematically evaluating program reviews for completeness and quality.\(^2\)
- Area Prioritization: Each vice president ranks resource requests from his or her own Division.\(^3\)
- Resource Request Prioritization: The PIE Committee recommends a ranking of requests for new resources.
- Budgeting: The Budget Committee develops the next budget.
- Evaluation of the Cycle Itself.
PROGRAM REVIEW
WLAC has been conducting program review since 2003. Each fall semester sees the preparation of program reviews across campus, facilitated since 2012 by the IES. This online system provides a series of questions, many accompanied by quantitative data, in two parts. In the first, the authors review progress toward meeting current goals, evaluate enrollment trends and implications for the unit, and consider the need for new programs and courses. Student learning outcome assessment is included in the data analyzed. Also included in the unit reflection and self-evaluation section is an analysis of equity gaps in course completion rates. In the second part, the authors identify goals for the future. All goals developed by programs must be aligned with one or more goals of the Educational Master Plan. (In planning for program review in fall 2014, the PIE Committee noted that the new Educational Master Plan would have be accepted by the College by October in order to be used in the 2014 program review. Program review authors were asked to consider the draft EMP as they made the connections between unit plans and College plans with the understanding that if the EMP were adopted, its strategies, goals and objectives would guide subsequent steps in the planning process, such as validation and resource request prioritization.) If a proposed goal requires additional financial resources, the author completes a resource request.
VALIDATION AND AREA PRIORITIZATION
Program reviews enter the validation process as they are completed. Teams of deans, faculty, and vice presidents evaluate the program reviews for completeness and quality using a set of questions provided in the IES. Particular attention is paid to the linkage between College goals and those of smaller units, as well as to the relationships between unit goals, planned actions, and resource requests. As necessary, validators return program reviews to their authors for revision. Once all program reviews in a Division are validated, the vice president of that Division creates an area prioritization.

RESOURCE REQUEST PRIORITIZATION
The PIE Committee consults both the program reviews and the area prioritizations in creating a prioritized list of resource requests for the entire campus; the Committee uses a rubric for this process. After review by the Budget Committee, this list goes to the College Council for its approval, and then to the college president.

An important exception to the new resource prioritization process concerns new faculty positions. Since its founding in 1994, the Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization (FPIP) Committee of the Academic Senate has been responsible for recommending which positions should be filled, and this process enjoys widespread support. The FPIP Committee does not consider new positions unless they are identified in program review. This requirement is part of FPIP Policy and is enforced in practice. The FPIP list, a ranking of faculty positions, goes to the Academic Senate for recommendation to the college president.

BUDGETING
Resource request prioritization takes place early in the spring semester. At the same time, the Budget Committee is overseeing the development of the new budget, following the timeline established by the Los Angeles Community College District. The new budget informs decisions about meeting the resource requests. In making the final decisions on the budget, the college president consults the Resource Prioritization list and the FPIP list.

EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS
Each spring the PIE Committee revises the program review instrument and procedures, and this is reflected in an updated Handbook. The PIE Committee evaluates the program review instrument annually, using a Program Review Workgroup (PRW) to conduct a systematic evaluation of the program review process. In 2013 the PRW reviewed College progress in using the recommendations of a consultant who had assisted the College after its 2012 accreditation. In 2014 the PIE Committee conducted an evaluation survey of program review and used the results, in addition to other materials, to identify changes needed in the program review process. As a result, the PRW recommended realigning the programs required to complete program review together in order to avoid duplication of effort for externally-accredited or certified programs, so that data gathered and assessed for an accreditation review will feed into program review.
without having to be re-aggregated. At the same time, the workgroup and the FPIP Committee collaborated to align the data required for FPIP with that required for program review. The Academic Senate approved the changes beginning with the 2014 program review.

The Budget Committee and the PIE Committee hold two joint meetings a year, one to evaluate the effectiveness of resource allocations, and the other to evaluate the planning, evaluation and resource allocation process. Improvements to College processes arising from these meetings have been adopted, using a well-established system of shared governance. Most recently, the March 2014 recommendations that the prioritized list of resource requests be consulted all year and that a process be identified to fund supplies and other ongoing needs each resulted in College Council recommendations to the president, which he accepted.

COLLEGE-WIDE SUPPORT
This planning cycle has broad support. In the three years the PIE Committee has used the resource prioritization process, the College Council has recommended the prioritized list to the college president with no changes, and he has used it determining new expenditures, including those that have become possible after the adoption of the annual budget. The Institutional Effectiveness System (IES) provides not only data used in completing program reviews, but serves as a repository for that data and for the information developed in the program review process itself. The Office of Research and Planning produces reports from the IES that support informed discussion in multiple venues. As detailed in connection with Recommendation 1, these reports have informed the development of measurable goals in college master plans.

DATA COMPETENCIES
Program review, supported in the IES, “provides a systematic approach to maintaining the quality of data and assessments through broad-based focused dialog.” Many of the data sets to be addressed in each program review are embedded in the IES in the form of links to District, College and government webpages. The Program Review Handbook also defines key data. Each year the program review process begins with training sessions for the various authors, from faculty to classified managers. In the validation stage, teams of deans, vice presidents, Division chairs and others use the validation questions provided in IES to check for accuracy and reasonableness in the use of these defined data. They return program reviews for revision until the discussion of each data set is sufficiently developed.
Examples of Program Review Validation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Assessment &amp; Continuous Process Improvement</th>
<th>Is the information presented accurate? Have the /department/program goals been assessed? Have improvements and effectiveness of resource allocation been assessed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Trends</td>
<td>Is the information presented accurate? Were the implications for division/department/program planning discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Is the information presented accurate? Is the area meeting College goals for assessment completion? Is the area using assessment results for program improvement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broad participation in Achieving the Dream (ATD) has deepened faculty, staff and administrator competence in the evaluation of data, strengthening the College’s ability to use its established shared governance processes to make informed decisions. The Enrollment Management Committee, the Facilities Committee, and the Educational Master Plan Workgroup have each in its own way grappled with carefully-chosen, significant data sets to produce, respectively, class schedules supporting the consistent attainment of FTES goals, a Facilities Master Plan Update accounting for space needs identified in program review and current inventory, and a draft Educational Master Plan predicated on internal and external environmental scans. Committee and workgroup deliberations are discussed in more detail in connection with Recommendation 13 of 2006.

**Evidence: Recommendation 2**
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2 2013-2014 Program Review Handbook, pages 36-41:

3 2013-2014 Program Review Handbook, page 42:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/PRHandbook42.pdf
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Program Review Process Evaluation Survey Results 2013-2014:
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Program Review Workgroup Minutes, May 5, 2014:

Academic Senate Minutes, September 23, 2014, Item III:

Joint Meeting: PIE Committee and Budget Committee Minutes, February 28, 2013:
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WLAC 2015 Midterm Report: Recommendation 2


President’s Response to College Council Recommendation, February 27, 2014: http://www.wlac.edu/Collegecouncil/President%20Response%20to%20CC%20Rec%20of%202-6-140001.pdf


27 Educational Master Plan Workgroup environmental scan data sources: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee/EMP.html#Environmental_Scan_Data
Recommendation 3

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)*

OVERVIEW

Since the 2013 Follow-up Report, WLAC has continued to engage in a systematic, focused approach for student learning outcome (SLO) assessment at the course, program, and institutional levels in order to improve student learning. WLAC’s SLO team now consists of a coordinator who is a full-time faculty member, the dean of teaching and learning, and six SLO facilitators. SLO facilitators provide support for faculty in completing assessments, developing SLOs, and understanding the SLO assessment calendar. They attend monthly SLO Committee meetings and SLO facilitators’ meetings. SLO facilitators are assigned to Divisions; by the middle of December 2014, an SLO facilitator will be assigned to every Division with larger Divisions having more than one SLO facilitator. The Office of Research and Planning provides assistance, and the College has supported these efforts by hiring an assistant research analyst, half of whose assignment is in support of the SLO process.¹

The Academic Senate has approved at least one SLO for every course offered, and faculty are participating in a continuous cycle of adding and modifying SLOs to fully reflect course objectives. The Curriculum Committee assures that addenda to Course Outlines of Record include the appropriate SLOs. The compressed course SLO assessment of 2012-2013, in which the cycle of assessment, discussion, and identification of necessary changes took place in only two semesters, resulted in SLO assessments for 90 percent of the courses offered in 2012-2013. In 2013, the faculty committed to a more sustainable four-semester cycle in which they will assess all course SLOs in all courses offered within 4 years (Fall 2013-Spring 2017).²

Division chairs developed calendars that schedule when all courses and course SLOs will be assessed within the 4-year cycle. The calendar serves as a visual communication tool for faculty to know when their course is due for assessment and in what phase their
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A course is in the SLO cycle. The calendars also detail when course SLOs are due for assessment as well as planning for the assessment of additional CSLOs.

To assess WLAC’s institutional SLOs, the SLO Committee partners with the Annual Student Poster Showcase. Faculty use rubrics to assess a sample of posters and the ratings are tabulated. As a result of ISLO assessment, the rubrics have been modified to provide raters with more information to aid them in assessment. Questions related to the institutional SLOs in the annual Graduate Survey also provide evidence on the achievement of institutional SLOs. Students self-report on how their abilities with respect to each of the institutional SLOs have changed due to their coursework and experiences at WLAC. The SLO Committee evaluates the data and makes changes to improve the process. As a result of assessment on the Graduate Survey, the questions were revised for clarity.

Part of each Academic Senate meeting is devoted to presentations by individual academic Divisions. In 2013-2014, these presentations focused on SLO assessment and especially on the changes the Divisions made to their programs as a result of what was learned in SLO assessment, with reports from Health, Dance and PE; Applied Technology; Computer Science and Information Technology; Allied Health; Mathematics; Counseling; Behavioral and Social Sciences; Humanities and Fine Arts; Business; Science; Library; Language Arts; and Learning Skills.

2013-2014: COURSE SLOS

Faculty made the transition from the condensed SLO assessment process detailed in the Follow-Up Report to a more deliberate four-phase cycle in 2013-2014. By fall 2014 all Division chairs had developed calendars that schedule course SLO assessment for all courses by spring 2017. In Phase 1, faculty teach the course and assess one or more of its SLOs. During Phase 2, faculty discuss course assessment results, decide upon changes needed to improve learning in the course, and complete the processes necessary to implement the changes. Phase 3 takes place when the course is taught again; faculty implement the changes, and re-assess the SLO. During Phase 4, faculty discuss the reassessment results to close the loop. Phases 3 and 4 continue until all course SLOs are satisfactorily met.
Since 2013, the college has used an electronic Adobe PDF form developed by the dean of Teaching and Learning to record course SLO assessments in all four phases. A handbook assists faculty in completing the form. This course SLO assessment tool retains the majority of information from the previous, paper-based assessment tool. The following question was added to strengthen the connection between SLO assessment and Program Review: “Will any changes indicated necessitate a resource request?” All responses are captured on the form, and faculty can also attach student work and rubrics directly to it. Responses are then exported into an Excel file to facilitate data collection. The assistant research analyst assigned to SLOs monitors and updates the Adobe PDF electronic form submissions and develops reports based on the course SLO assessments that have been received. She emails confirmation to faculty who have submitted their SLO assessment and indicates if any items are missing from it, and she also provides contact information for the SLO facilitators in case faculty need further assistance. This process ensures the completeness of SLO assessment.

For the 2013-2014 academic year, the course SLO assessment results are tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL 2013</th>
<th>SPRING 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course SLO Assessments Scheduled</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course SLO Assessments Filed</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO Achieved</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course SLO Assessments Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course SLO Assessments Filed</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the SLO assessment calendars developed for every Division and an expanded SLO team that includes SLO facilitators and an assistant research analyst, the SLO team expects fall 2014 assessments to be completed at much higher percentages. SLO calendars visually communicate to faculty when each of their courses is due for assessment. SLO facilitators receive training from the SLO Coordinator to work with faculty individually, in small groups, and at Division SLO meetings to complete assessments. The SLO Team is continuing to work with faculty and Division chairs to gather and submit assessments from Fall 2013-Spring 2014.

Faculty are documenting mindful discussions regarding changes that lead to continuous improvement in the classroom and in the SLO assessment cycle. During the dialogue phase, faculty discuss approved rubric(s), analyze and interpret assessment data, document all important course components that influence class success, and identify necessary action to improve learning in the course.

For example, Aviation faculty learned that their students were not well prepared for the oral portion of the federal licensing exam. In response they developed special assignments involving student presentations. Aviation faculty also reached out to the Dental Hygiene faculty and students to provide guidance in making effective presentations. Computer Science 901 faculty have implemented the following changes to improve the introduction to computers class: (1) request free 3-week software access from the publisher for students to use while waiting for their financial aid award to purchase course materials; (2) enhance tutoring services and instructor office hours; and (3) make the first 3 weeks’ topics more relevant, interesting, and useful to students in order to increase retention. Each semester, the Mathematics faculty modify the common final exams to better assess course SLOs. Other interventions taking place that are helping enhance student learning include incorporating activities and strategies from the Five-Day Experiential Learning Institute (FELI), Reading Apprenticeship, Acceleration, and Re-imagining English 21.

**SLO RESOURCES**

A full-time faculty member in the Language Arts Division began work as the new SLO coordinator in January 2014. The position focuses on providing leadership regarding assessment dialogue and using assessment results for improvement. The following goals were stated in the job announcement: (1) Successful campus-wide ongoing dialogue on student learning outcomes; (2) Ongoing continuous closed-loop student learning outcomes assessment at the course, program, institutional, student services, and administrative services levels; and (3) Using college-wide assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching, learning, and the delivery of services. To improve teaching and learning, the SLO coordinator is responsible for providing leadership and guidance to faculty and staff for the development and assessment of outcomes at the course, program, institutional, Student Services, and Administrative Services levels.

WLAC 2015 Midterm Report: Recommendation 3
The SLO coordinator has identified six new SLO facilitators who are working with Divisions to facilitate assessments, dialogue, and to identify improvements to be made as a result of assessment. The SLO facilitators assist faculty across the campus in developing additional course SLOs, completing assessments, and scheduling courses for assessment on the 4-semester cycle. By the middle of December 2014, an SLO facilitator will be assigned to every Division with larger Divisions having more than one SLO facilitator.

The College engaged in a broad and systematic training program to prepare faculty to define and assess course SLOs. During Flex Week in August 2013, the SLO coordinator presented two workshops: SLO Assessment Calendars and SLO Dialogue. On Flex Day, he and the dean of Teaching and Learning led a breakout session, SLOs: Bringing the Students In, which focused on sharing ways of making student connections to SLOs. They introduced the new Student SLO webpage and provided guiding questions to help faculty frame course student learning outcomes. The previous SLO coordinator was a featured presenter at Los Angeles Mission College’s Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Summit in October 2013, presenting a session on Best Practices for Encouraging Student and Faculty Dialogue about SLOs and Assessment. During Professional Development Week (formerly known as Flex Week) in August 2014, the SLO coordinator and dean of Teaching and Learning facilitated a session titled SLO Experiences. This session provided faculty with current SLO insights from multiple disciplines. Faculty from English, Aviation, and English as a Second Language discussed their experiences when assessing and implementing changes in their classes.

The SLO coordinator, along with facilitators, organized a successful SLO Symposium in spring 2014. Thirty-four faculty members, representing all Divisions across campus, participated in this event. Amanda Ryan-Romo, Learning Assessment Coordinator at East Los Angeles College, presented an engaging framework for reviewing assessment data and conducting dialogue. Valerie Landau, Director of Assessment at Samuel Merritt University, demonstrated a unique database system to map course SLOs to program and institutional SLOs. Participants also reviewed and discussed the ATLAS Framework for Looking at Data that guides faculty in reviewing and discussing assessment data. The event was recorded and posted online for faculty who could not attend.

In May 2014, the SLO team conducted hands-on workshops with the Business Division and the Behavioral and Social Sciences Division to discuss the 2012-13 assessments and the 2013-2017 cycle. Faculty also completed assessments at the meetings. A 2014-15 workshop calendar schedules hands-on workshops with all Divisions and is updated in SLO newsletters. The SLO team attends workshops to assist in completing assessments, engaging in dialogue, and developing plans of action. The SLO coordinator and the dean of Teaching and Learning are coordinating with the professional development
The Academic Senate reiterated the faculty commitment to systematic and timely assessment in June 2014 when it adopted a recommendation from the SLO Committee to set the date that final grades are due each semester as the deadline for the completion of calendared course SLO assessment activities for that semester. The Academic Senate also adopted a recommendation from the SLO Committee to implement an evaluation process pursuant to the AFT 1521 collective bargaining agreement if a full-time or part-time faculty member does not complete his or her contractually-required assessment work by the scheduled due date.

**PROGRAM SLOs**

Faculty discuss and document program SLO assessment in program review, which is assessed during the validation phase. The SLO module in program review includes questions such as, “Based on any of the following assessment methods: (a) course SLO assessment; (b) analysis of course sequencing; (c) indirect assessment indicators such as state exams or employer surveys; (d) student success data such as retention, success rates, degrees/certificates awarded, what changes to the program are planned or being implemented?” and “Will these planned changes based on Program SLO assessment necessitate a resource request?”

Now that the college has an Assistant Research Analyst assigned to support SLO assessment, reports generated from course SLO assessment forms help track and support this kind of analysis.

As a result of Program SLO assessment, the Business Division plans to review their course sequencing to determine the most efficient method for their students’ matriculation. Business faculty have also discovered that many students lack fundamental math computational skills and writing skills; they plan to increase tutorial services in these areas. Learning Skills faculty will collaborate with math and English faculty to ensure that curricula are designed to meet students’ needs.

Program SLOs will be printed in the 2014-2016 College Catalog. Faculty and Division chairs have reviewed and revised their program student learning outcomes. The SLO coordinator and dean of Teaching and Learning developed an SLO Handbook about best practices for writing program SLOs. Program SLOs are also posted on the SLO website.

**DATA MANAGEMENT**

The course SLO assessment tools include a systematic mapping of course SLOs to program SLOs and institutional SLOs in order to support the development of multiple and integrated strategies for assessing student achievement and regularly identifying areas that require improvement. Evaluation of WLAC’s SLO systems, in pursuit of continuous improvement, revealed that a more robust data management system was
needed to make full use of this data. Plans to develop capacities in the IES were too expensive. The SLO team, together with the dean of Research and Planning, reviewed seven SLO assessment databases, including one developed within the District, for adoption at WLAC. The team used a rubric to identify databases that meet WLAC’s requirements, including: facilitating roll-up from course SLO to program SLO to institutional SLO data; reporting capability; better connection to program review and resource requests; and a document repository. After viewing demonstrations of the seven databases and applying the rubric, the team narrowed the choice to two commercial software packages, and used a more focused rubric in evaluating them. Additional demonstrations of these two software packages involved two groups of users: (1) Administrative users to evaluate the software architecture and (2) Faculty users to consider the layout and organization of the software. The team made a recommendation for adoption in November 2014, with implementation tentatively slated for early spring 2015.

**Evidence: Recommendation 3**


6 SLO Committee Minutes, April 15, 2013:

SLO Committee Minutes, July 15, 2013:

SLO Committee Minutes, September 16, 2013:

SLO Committee Minutes, October 21, 2013:

SLO Committee Minutes, March 24, 2014:

SLO Committee Minutes, April 28, 2014:

SLO Committee Minutes, May 19, 2014:

SLO Committee Minutes, September 22, 2014:

7 Academic Senate Minutes, October 8, 2013, page 2:

8 Academic Senate Minutes, October 22, 2013, page 1:

9 Academic Senate Minutes, November 12, 2013, page 1:

10 Academic Senate Minutes, November 26, 2013, page 2:
11 Academic Senate Minutes, February 25, 2014, page 2-3:

12 Academic Senate Minutes, March 11, 2014, page 2-3:

13 Academic Senate Minutes, March 25, 2014, Item V:

14 Academic Senate Minutes, March 25, 2014, Item V:

15 Academic Senate Minutes, June 3, 2014, Item V:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/committees/academic-senate/SENATE-Minutes-6-3-2014.pdf

16 Academic Senate Minutes, June 3, 2014, Item V:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/committees/academic-senate/SENATE-Minutes-6-3-2014.pdf

17 Academic Senate Minutes, May 13, 2014, Item V:

18 Academic Senate Minutes, May 13, 2014, Item V:

19 Academic Senate Minutes, April 22, 2014, Item VI.12:

20 SLO Assessment Calendars: http://www.wlac.edu/committees/slos/SLO-Calendars.aspx

21 SLO 4-semester Course SLO Assessment Cycle, revised May 2013:

22 Course SLO Assessment Tool, Adobe PDF form:

Academic Senate Minutes, September 24, 2013, Item VI.3.a:
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23 Course SLO Assessment Form, September 2013, Adobe PDF Instructions: [http://www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/documents/CSLO_AssessmentPDF_Form-Instructions.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/documents/CSLO_AssessmentPDF_Form-Instructions.pdf)


27 SLO Coordinator Job Announcement: [http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/committees/slo/FacultySLO-Coordinator-Nov2013doc.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/committees/slo/FacultySLO-Coordinator-Nov2013doc.pdf)


34 SLO Symposium 2014 Presentations: [http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL2r8MwiEK5f5P3wkzLWMBq4GEW2uqnwK9](http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL2r8MwiEK5f5P3wkzLWMBq4GEW2uqnwK9)
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36 Academic Senate Minutes, June 3, 2014, Item VI.9.f:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/committees/academic-senate/SENATE-Minutes-6-3-2014.pdf

37 Draft Academic Senate Minutes, October 28, 2014, Item VII.1.d:

38 Program Review 2013-2014 Handbook, page 10:

39 Program Review 2013-2014, SLO Report, Instructional Areas, page 9:

40 Program Review 2013-2014, SLO Report, Student Services Areas, page 7:

41 *Back to the Basics: Writing Program SLOs Handbook:*

42 Program Student Learning Outcomes: http://www.wlac.edu/committees/slos/Program-SLOs.aspx

43 2012 Program Review Resource Requests, Research and Planning, page 24
Program Review Resource Requests, Research and Planning, page 24:

44 SLO Assessment & Tracking Platform Product Comparison Rubric:

45 SLO Software Comparison:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/committees/slo/eLumen-TracDat-SoftwareComparison.pdf
Recommendation 4

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 I.B.3, II.B.4, IV.A.2.b, IV.B.4).

OVERVIEW
Since 2012, both Student Services and Administrative Services have been assessing outcomes both in quantitative and qualitative terms to evaluate whether services are meeting student needs. Representatives from Administrative Services and Student Services serve on the SLO Committee.

Student Services is reviewing and refining Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) for all Student Services departments. Each department is revising and developing two SAOs by the end of Fall 2014 for assessment in Spring 2015.

Administrative Services has developed and assessed Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). During 2012-2014, the departments that comprise Administrative Services all completed assessment of their SAOs, identifying areas needing improvement, and adjusting their processes to achieve better results.

The College contracts with a local business to run the café. Data to judge its services will come from the bi-annual Campus Climate Survey to be carried out in spring 2015. The District’s contract with the LA County Sheriff to provide security at all the District colleges includes performance standards. District-wide evaluation of the Sheriff’s service, based on those metrics, is scheduled for spring 2015.

STUDENT SERVICES USES OF 2012-2013 OUTCOMES ASSESSMENTS
Admissions analyzed complaint patterns and determined the need for additional staff to answer phones. A review of student appeals packets revealed that Admissions needed to instruct students that appeals cannot be considered without supporting documents.

The Associated Students Organization (ASO) conducted a focus group in Spring 2013 to collect qualitative data to assess student technological competence and civic engagement. From the focus group, Student Services deans and staff learned that nearly
all students have a mobile device that they can use to access services. Deans and staff are considering developing online services that are conducive to viewing and accessing in a mobile environment. In terms of civic engagement, students (particularly ASO students) seem so engaged that they may need help in learning to prioritize their activities so as not to overcommit themselves, impairing their studies. Also, ASO students seem to have the ability to get other students more engaged. Student Services will explore using them as peer mentors and ambassadors in a more organized manner.

Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S) assessment included a survey of current DSPS students and revealed two areas that need improvement: assistive technology training and student government participation. To address these areas, DSP&S staff will reinstitute the Assistive Technology Learning Skills course and revive the Students with Disabilities Club.

The Child Development Center (CDC) conducted a parent survey during spring 2014. Based on the survey results, CDC staff recognized the need to: assess parents’ needs for services and resources during intake and recertification appointments and provide information regarding community and in-house services and resources; inform parents of additional community, school, and campus resources (e.g., via newsletters and flyers regarding events); update the parent handbook to highlight the educational background of teachers and staff; refer to the updated Discipline Approaches section in the CDC Handbook during intakes; discuss or review positive discipline approaches for preschool age children during parent meetings, training, and during parent-teacher conferences.

REFINING STUDENT SERVICES ASSESSMENT
As a result of evaluating the assessment cycle itself, Student Services has been engaging in reviewing and refining SAOs for all Student Services departments, and transitioning from calling some of its outcomes “Service Level Outcomes” to clearly differentiate between Student Learning Outcomes and Service Area Outcomes. Each department is developing at least two SAOs and will assess them yearly. The process for each department includes: identifying the services offered; aligning with goals identified in program review; connecting to the Educational Master Plan goals and objectives; aligning with institutional SLOs; defining benchmarks; and identifying assessment methods, including both qualitative and quantitative ones. The assessment report will include a description of how the assessment was administered, analysis of the results, and a plan of action.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES USES OF 2012-2013 OUTCOMES ASSESSMENTS
During the 2012-2013 academic year, the departments that comprise Administrative Services – Bookstore, Business Office, Plant Facilities, Information Technology, Personnel/Payroll, Procurement, and Staff Services – all completed assessment of their SAOs. By tabulating the percentage of phone calls going to voice mail during business...
hours, the Business Office recognized the need to route calls differently, including both the staff at the window and the college financial administrator. InfoTech measured the speed at which help desk requests were resolved and recognized the need to better publicize the types of services it supports. They are also launching a remote desktop management application project so staff can troubleshoot issues remotely, which improves response time. Analyzing service requests led Plant Facilities to schedule additional daily servicing of restrooms.

Food services and the Sheriff’s Office are contracted services. Data on the Administrative Services will be developing SAOs for the Food Services and Sheriff’s Office. Although these two areas are contracted services, developing and assessing area outcomes will provide useful information to measure and evaluate how they are meeting student needs.

**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ASSESSMENT DATA**

The Business Office, Plant Facilities, and Procurement use internal data from system databases such as Computerized Maintenance Management Systems (CMMS) and SAP reports. Plant Facilities has conducted SAO assessment by monitoring and tracking requests for maintenance, work orders, and cleaning requests through phone calls and the work order system (Tamis). As a result of this assessment the College is improving the faculty and student learning environment by implementing CMMS, which streamlines maintenance operations through preventative maintenance and work-order tracking. CMMS provides a single point of interaction with operational applications, processes, and staff to reduce work order request response time and minimize emergencies by turning the maintenance from a reactive to a proactive organization.

The target SAO for the Procurement Office is to process purchase orders in a timely manner (five business days or less from creation to first printing for at least 90% of all Purchase Orders in the period analyzed). The SAO criterion was exceeded in fall 2013 (93%), but was not met in spring 2014. As a result of assessment, the Procurement Office will increase the SAP electronic approvals to twice per business week.

Of the seven Administrative Services departments, the following four use data from questions in the Campus Climate Survey: Bookstore, Information Technology, Personnel/Payroll, and Staff Services. The next Campus Climate Survey will be administered in spring 2015, and those departments will complete SAO assessment using the survey results.
Evidence: Recommendation 4

1 ASO Assessment Report, Spring 2013:

2 Program Review 2013-2014, Student Services Areas, page 8:

3 Child Development Center Assessment Report, Spring 2014
   http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/committees/slo/stud_svc/CDC_SLO_081414.pdf

4 Student Services, Service Area Outcomes, 2014-15 Matrix:

5 Business Office Assessment Report, Spring 2013:

6 InfoTech Assessment Report, Fall 2012:

7 Plant Facilities Assessment Report, Fall 2012:

8 Procurement Assessment Report, Fall 2013:

   Procurement Assessment Report, Spring 2014:
Recommendation 5

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.*)

OVERVIEW
The 2012 College catalog contains an academic freedom statement on page 7 and a statement on the acceptance of transfer on page 48. It has been available online since November 2012\(^1\) and in print since January 2013.

CATALOG PRODUCTION SYSTEMS
For the 2014-2016 College catalog, the dean of Curriculum and Career and Technical Education (CTE) oversaw a major revision, focusing on helping students complete degrees and certificates. Curriculum maps are the backbone of this approach, presented as a “Recommended Course Sequence” for each degree.\(^2\) The College assigned an adjunct faculty member to help faculty and chairs develop maps for all degrees and certificates. The dean met with the counseling Division to assure that the faculty-recommended curriculum maps supported the development of Student Educational Plans.

The dean of Curriculum and CTE led a catalog workgroup consisting of the SLO coordinator, the dean of Teaching and Learning, the Curriculum Committee chair, articulation officer, dean of Admissions and Records, the vice president of Student Services, and the curriculum administrative aide. The workgroup developed a catalog production timeline\(^3\) and oversaw the collection of the materials needed. The dean of Curriculum and CTE announced the catalog production tasks at College committee meetings including the Divisional Council, Dean’s meetings, Division Faculty meetings, the Enrollment Management Committee, and the Curriculum Committee.\(^4\) The workgroup used a checklist derived from the 2014 “Catalog Requirements” section of the ACCJC Standards to assure that all required elements were included.\(^5\) The workgroup identified catalog components and designated the units of the College to be responsible for providing the information.

The catalog was available online in November 2014,\(^6\) and printed copies were expected on campus in January 2015. New information, courses, programs and corrections will be inserted into the online version; this is noted in the published version. The catalog production timeline includes the production of the next edition of the catalog so that the procedures established to ensure catalog completeness, timeliness, and accuracy can be maintained.
Evidence: Recommendation 5

1 West Los Angeles College Catalog, 2014-2016, Front Matter:  
http://www.wlac.edu/academics/pdf/WLAC_12-14Catalog_FRONT.pdf

2 West Los Angeles College Catalog, 2014-2016, Major Requirements:  
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/catalog/2014Catalog-Majors-SectionFinal.pdf

3 College Catalog Project Schedule 2014-2016:  
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/CATALOGProductionSchedule.pdf

4 Allied Health Department Division Meeting Minutes, May 12, 2014, Item 5.B:  
Curriculum Committee Minutes, April 28, 2014, Item III.3:  

5 College Catalog Checklist:  

West Los Angeles College Catalog, 2014-2016, Acceptance of Transfer statement, page 45; Academic Freedom statement, page 6:  

6 West Los Angeles College Catalog 2014-2016:  
http://www.wlac.edu/Academic/College-Catalog.aspx
Recommendation 6

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)

OVERVIEW
As noted in the report of the 2013 Follow-Up Visit Team, WLAC consistently funded the acquisition of library collections and databases appropriate to its programs and mission. Since that visit, the College has continued to increase library funding – see chart on next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Year 2011-12</th>
<th>Year 2012-13</th>
<th>Year 2013-14</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>10100</td>
<td>10100</td>
<td>10100</td>
<td>10100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Regular</td>
<td>$1,000,562</td>
<td>$1,149,622</td>
<td>$1,073,996</td>
<td>$3,224,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Hourly</td>
<td>$95,696</td>
<td>$84,072</td>
<td>$224,407</td>
<td>$404,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Student</td>
<td>$27,073</td>
<td>$39,626</td>
<td>$44,161</td>
<td>$110,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,750</td>
<td>$37,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$9,261</td>
<td>$6,420</td>
<td>$10,912</td>
<td>$26,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>$41,663</td>
<td>$35,525</td>
<td>$9,649</td>
<td>$86,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,245,347</td>
<td>$1,315,265</td>
<td>$1,406,557</td>
<td>$3,967,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTEA</td>
<td>10599</td>
<td>10580</td>
<td>10581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$15,994</td>
<td>$15,537</td>
<td>$15,519</td>
<td>$47,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
<td>$8,710</td>
<td>$8,734</td>
<td>$25,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$24,290</td>
<td>$24,247</td>
<td>$24,253</td>
<td>$72,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE V</td>
<td>17365</td>
<td>17365</td>
<td>17365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$4,904</td>
<td>$27,644</td>
<td>$19,204</td>
<td>$51,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>$4,904</td>
<td>$27,644</td>
<td>$19,204</td>
<td>$51,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$42,149</td>
<td>$67,226</td>
<td>$80,580</td>
<td>$189,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>17341</td>
<td>17341/17354</td>
<td>17354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$27,726</td>
<td>$13,142</td>
<td>$37,312</td>
<td>$78,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 20 (LOTTERY)</td>
<td>10421</td>
<td>10421</td>
<td>10421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$232,578</td>
<td>$265,610</td>
<td>$498,188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,339,512</td>
<td>$1,652,457</td>
<td>$1,814,312</td>
<td>$4,806,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The security wall that was installed in 2013 to address the issues regarding book security has resulted in a reduction in the number of books reported missing. The glass wall has also created an attractive display area for large items such as the prize-winning posters from the annual Student Showcases.

IDENTIFYING NEEDS
Library faculty and staff continue to use the annual College-wide program review to document identified needs and forward them for validation and prioritization. Underlying annual planning is a long-range plan for ensuring that the collections are current and support the College’s varied curriculum, which provides an estimate of the dollar amount needed on an annual basis. In the validation phase of the 2013 and 2014 program reviews, the dean overseeing the library confirmed the library’s needs for both collection development and additional staffing. Following established processes, the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee ranked the collection and equipment needs high, while the Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization (FPIP) Committee recognized the need for additional librarians. Because library staff support instructional equipment across the campus, the library program review has also included requests for additional resources for use outside of the library, and these requests have also ranked highly.

The library’s collection development policy defines resource selection and needs identification procedures. Among the sources of data for needs identification described in the collection development policy are circulation statistics (including online database access), reference desk logs, and surveys of faculty and students. A librarian serves on the Curriculum Committee, where she tracks the needs connected with new courses. The library faculty also seek the advice of classroom faculty through direct and email dialogue, by visiting programs and Divisions across the campus, and through the Library Advisory Committee. Library faculty and staff track changes in campus curricular needs as well as in preferred modes of delivery, such as eBooks. Allowing for unavoidable budget reductions due to fluctuations in College funding, the Library Collection Development policy provides a mechanism for the reduction of educational resources, such as decreasing the number of books ordered, or suspending subscriptions to electronic collections. The policy also provides guidelines for revision of the policy itself.

In fall 2014 the library advisory committee broadened its membership to include faculty from programs with major library needs, such as allied health, computer science and paralegal, and external “friends of the library.”
MEETING THE NEEDS
Like most California Community Colleges, WLAC deals with a complex budgeting process. Restricted funds must go to approved uses, and vary widely from year to year. For example, funds from Proposition 20 have been available since 2013, in amounts ranging from $195,412 to $278,542. Furthermore, a significant portion of enrollment-based funding is calculated months after the end of the funded academic year. The multi-year plan for library collections helps the College deal with this fluctuation. With needs identified and prioritized, and senior staff committed to consulting the prioritized list as funds become available, the College is ready to allocate funds as they become available. Specially funded programs usually make up the bulk of the collections budget. This has resulted in a process that provides for sustainable growth and improvement of resources and services that support the curriculum in a timely and transparent manner.

When available funds have exceeded the target for a given year, the College has used the opportunity to meet identified needs ahead of the multi-year schedule. For example, Proposition 20 funding which became available in September 2013 covered the cost of all the book and periodical purchases for 2013-2014. General funds allocated to the library in the 2013-2014 budget could then be put to other identified needs, and in July 2014 purchased 39 new computers for the Library Instructional Research Lab to replace aging student computer stations. In September 2014, the College Council recommended that Proposition 20 funds be devoted to library collections.

In 2013, the FPIP process identified the need to hire three librarians. One full-time librarian was hired in 2013, and the remaining needs were met with adjunct (hourly) library faculty. When a library staff member retired in July 2014, the College immediately began the process to replace her, and a new staff member came to work in August 2014.

Evidence: Recommendation 6

1 Evaluation Report: Follow-Up Visit, 2013, page 14:

2 Program Review Excerpts, 2013-2014, pages 122-124:

3 Library Instructional Resource Prioritization:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw6SuiCO67KCcnZQcExJWXAYLWs/edit?usp=sharing

WLAC 2015 Midterm Report: Recommendation 6
4 Prioritized list of Resource Requests for 2014-2015:

Prioritized list of Resource Requests for 2013-2014:

5 FPIP Committee Minutes, April 24, 2013, Item 3:
http://www.wlac.edu/fpip/FPIP%20Minutes%2020April%2024%202013-FINAL.pdf

6 Prioritized list of Resource Requests for 2014-2015:

Prioritized list of Resource Requests for 2013-2014:

7 Collection Development Statement:

8 Reference Desk Subject Shortage and Missing Title Logs:

9 Fall 2012 Faculty Evaluation of Library:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw6SuiCO67KCWGU2UVNaDBPNm8/edit?usp=sharing

10 Fall 2013 WLAC Library Student Satisfaction survey:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1S2oCWlSRqGOG4c2V55gMD9mACEhw9MLPh0j0cUTCZL8/edit?usp=sharing Fall 2013 WLAC Library Student Satisfaction survey results:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1S2oCWlSRqGOG4c2V55gMD9mACEhw9MLPh0j0cUTCZL8/viewanalytics

11 Library Services Prezi presented to Academic Senate April 22, 2014:
http://prezi.com/lhv9kd-sk70/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy&rc=ex0share

February 3, 2014 library collections email to all faculty:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/Instruction-flyer-jpg.jpg

Book Request Form:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/184gL3qh87zALNltF2yaqrUp2ebxANRLDVks5vT1WZc/viewform

WLAC 2015 Midterm Report: Recommendation 6
WLAC Faculty Recommended Collection Development:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/184gL3qh87zALNltrF2yaqrUp2ebxANRLDVks5vT1WZc/viewform

Book List Sample, Language Arts:

February 27, 2014 Letter to Division chairs:

Language Arts Division Meeting Agenda, April 17, 2014, Item IV.A:

Emails setting up March 30, 2015 Library Advisory Committee Meeting, December 4, 2014:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/Library-Advisory-CommitteeEmail.pdf

College Council Minutes February 6, 2014, Item 4.A:
http://www.wlac.edu/Collegecouncil/CC%20Approved%20Minutes%202-6-14.pdf and PIE Committee Minutes January 8, 2014, page 4:

College Council Minutes September 4, 2014, Item 5.A:

FPIP Minutes, April 24, 2013, Item 3:
http://www.wlac.edu/fpip/FPIP%20Minutes%20April%202013-FINAL.pdf
Recommendation 7

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.)*

OVERVIEW

Following its 2012 comprehensive accreditation visit, WLAC undertook an evaluation of its process for program review, planning and resource allocation, and used the results of that evaluation to improve the process, while continuing to successfully use it. Assuring the College’s financial stability is fundamental to these procedures, ensuring that the College consistently balances its budget. Through its thriving governance system, the College discussed improvements to these processes, endorsed concrete measures, and oversaw their implementation.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

WLAC has demonstrated its ability to assure financial stability via systematic, collegial financial planning in years both lean and fat. The Budget Committee is a participatory governance committee that reports to the College Council. Its monthly budgets and expenditure reports provide an opportunity for College-wide dialogue about budgetary issues that arise, and provide direction when choices must be made. The single budget deficit was in fiscal year 2009, when state funding to community colleges began dropping abruptly.¹

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

The College meets its enrollment targets in Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) each year, thus minimizing unfunded class sections. The Office of Research and Planning regularly generates data to support enrollment management. The dean of Research and Planning reviews the state of enrollments at the weekly deans’ meeting, informing a weekly conversation that addresses class sizes, exclusions, retention, persistence, as well as outcomes of certificates, degrees, and transfers.

At monthly Divisional Council meetings the dean of Research and Planning reviews enrollment status with Division chairs. She also provides enrollment management reviews for SEAC and the Budget Committee. Weekly meetings of the college president with the three Vice Presidents also include regular review of enrollment management in the contexts of effectiveness, strategy, and overall budget management.
When budgets were reduced for the fiscal years from 2008 to 2011, the LACCD chancellor directed colleges to preserve fall and spring semesters and stressed the importance of full-time and part-time students’ access to complete programs in both CTE and general education programs. WLAC discontinued winter and summer inter-sessions in accordance with the chancellor’s guidelines.

The College used its governance and planning processes to make thoughtful, data-based, widely-understood and judicious cuts, often on very short notice. An enrollment management plan\textsuperscript{2} guided the Divisional Council in reducing class offerings while achieving some enrollment growth through increased class sizes. Although almost every program was affected, no credit programs were dropped. Cuts followed the guidelines of the enrollment management plan, which emphasized courses required for programs and those with high enrollments, while reducing multiple offerings of the same course. Outreach to high schools was curtailed. In addition, non-credit programs were reduced. For example, the College cut back its non-credit programs in senior citizen centers.

During the years of reductions, the WLAC’s average class size increased significantly as unemployment drove up student demand at a time of reduced course offerings from the 20 Community Colleges in Los Angeles County. FTES has increased since 2008, positioning the College to secure funding to grow toward a more sustainable size. District FTES goals began to increase in 2011-2012, and have risen each year since. WLAC has met the higher FTES goals using the same tools that assisted in the process of reducing FTES, beginning with reinstating intersessions in 2011.

**REVENUE ENHANCEMENT**

Since the adoption of the Revenue Enhancement Initiative (REI) in 2009, development has become an institutionalized responsibility. The effort continues to this day. “All Things Global” is a coordinated effort which has obtained support for college-wide attention to global implications for teaching, including global studies curricula and an annual global conference covering topics like internationalizing the curriculum and opportunities for study abroad. A recent Department of Education grant provides a half-million dollars to enhance the College’s Middle East Studies program with support for Arabic and Farsi language study and study abroad opportunities. The College has identified ambassadors from faculty and staff to mentor and advise international students; revenue from the College’s international and non-resident students program has grown from about $225,000 in 2008 to about $1.5 million in 2014, most of which is a contribution directly to the College’s general fund. The REI has provided sustained and continuous sources of income to enhance the College’s budget to diminish the negative impact of cuts from state funding and to support the College’s agenda to develop new programs and services that are consistent with program review and master planning.
ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT
The College acted on the recommendation of 2012 by adjusting its planning and budgeting processes to systematically assess the effective use of its financial resources and to employ the results of the evaluation to improve the institution. The Program Review Committee adjusted the timing of the program review cycle to provide more timely input into the development of the budget. The Budget Committee and the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee hold two joint meetings a year, one to evaluate the effectiveness of resource allocations and the other to evaluate the planning, evaluation and resource allocation process itself. Improvements to College processes arising from these meetings have been adopted using a long-established system of shared governance:

- In 2012 the Planning and Program Review Committees merged into the PIE Committee so that oversight of the program review, planning and resource prioritization process reside in one body.
- The PIE and Budget Committees met together to evaluate the effectiveness of expenditures in 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and a portion of 2013-2014.
- Recommendations arising from the joint PIE and Budget Committee analysis were assigned to appropriate committees or individuals for action and the results revisited in the next evaluation.
- Starting in 2013, program reviews began to evaluate the effect of past resource allocations, the effect of past resource requests not being funded, and the effect of hypothetical resource reductions.
- In the spring of 2014 the College Council clarified the use of the prioritized list of resource requests by recommending that the list be consulted when new funds appear during a year already budgeted, and the college president agreed to this adjustment.

Evidence: Recommendation 7

3 Joint meeting: PIE Committee and Budget Committee, February 28, 2013, Minutes: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/JointCommitteeMeetingMinutes02-28-13DRAFT.pdf
4 Joint meeting: PIE Committee and Budget Committee, May 8, 2014, Minutes:

5 Joint Meeting: Budget Committee and PIE Committee, Evaluation of Effective Use of
Financial Resources, May 8, 2014, Recommendations:

Planning and Budgeting Joint Meeting: Budget Committee and PIE Committee,
Evaluation of Planning and Budgeting Processes, March 6, 2014, Recommendations:

6 2013-2014 Program Review Handbook, page 16:

7 College Council Minutes, February 6, 2014, Item 4.A:
http://www.wlac.edu/Collegecouncil/CC%20Approved%20Minutes%202-6-14.pdf
Recommendation 6 of 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)*

**OVERVIEW**

All departments in the Student Services Division participate in the program review and planning cycle, ensuring an annual update to its self-assessment, including consideration of Service Area Outcome, and Service Level Outcome, and Student Learning Outcome assessments. In this process, the College gauges the quality of its services and explicitly aligns them with its mission. The vice president and deans in Student Services validate Student Services program reviews together as a team. Program review has helped the departments in Student Services reflect on past accomplishments and look toward the future. The same process has helped the College meet identified needs.

Student Services managers have used the program review, resource prioritization, and Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization (FPIP) processes to provide data and justification for hires across the Division in since 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review</th>
<th>Allocation Process</th>
<th>Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FPPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, DSPS, August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FPPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FPPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 and 2010</td>
<td>FPPIP</td>
<td>Counselor, General and Financial Aid, August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 and 2010</td>
<td>FPPIP</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>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Adjunct Counselors Fall 2012-Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Financial Aid Supervisor May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>FPPIP</td>
<td>CDC Director, September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 and 2013</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Sign Language Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Graduation Evaluator, Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Student Services Specialist, International Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Resource Prioritization</td>
<td>Outreach Recruiter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT SUCCESS AND SUPPORT PROGRAM
In September 2012, the state of California initiated the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), which requires that students receive orientation, assessment and educational planning services early in their College careers. The College responded expeditiously, launching West Expressway in spring 2013. West Expressway provides online workshops and a portal for signing up for in-person workshops and counseling appointments, so that students can complete orientation and assessment and receive an abbreviated Student Educational Plan. This program (then under Matriculation) was highly ranked in the resource prioritization list for 2013-2014, so when SSSP funds became available in 2013-2014, the College was prepared to use them efficiently, primarily for personnel, improving the hours of operation and quality of services for many service areas and reaching out to students most likely to be impacted by changed regulations. The SSSP program launched a campaign to alert all students of the new rules via the College website, workshops, through their instructors, and in face-to-face encounters. Workshops helped students to determine a course of study. Counselors and Career Guidance Assistants provided additional follow-up for at-risk students. Working together, the Counseling, Admissions and the SSSP program developed a process by which students can appeal priority registration decisions online or at the Admissions Office. In April, the Budget Committee approved an additional $39,690 for adjunct counseling through June 2014. (Student Services has also used the emergency budget process to cover supply and clerical budgets.) In 2013-2014, 4,450 students completed orientations; 2,800 completed assessments; 2,598 completed abbreviated Student Educational Plans. In fall 2013, 43% of students completed orientations, 27% assessed, and 25% completed abbreviated student educational plans. Since first-time students were only 21% of the total headcount, it is clear that continuing students make up part of these totals. The goal of SSSP being to serve first-time students, data on the students completing West Expressway must be further disaggregated.

SSSP activities continue in 2014-2015, with an additional layer of data, analysis and planning provided by the SSSP Plan submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office in October 2014. In addition to improved counseling and assessment services, the College has provided new services in Admissions and Records to handle transcript evaluation, prerequisite clearance, and a new appeals process for prerequisite challenges and for extensions of priority registration eligibility.
ASSESSING EFFECTIVENESS

The Student Services Division uses a range of data to assess its effectiveness. The Student Accountability and Records System (SARS) tracks counselor/student contacts, including phone calls and emails as well as office consultations and orientations. The Assessment Placement Management System records the number of students assessed for math, English and ESL placement. The College tracks services made available through the West Expressway through the Student Information system (SIS), including College orientation, career assessment, abbreviated Student Educational Plans, and follow-up services, such as contacts with students on academic probation. Surveys administered to evaluate the effectiveness of West Expressway in 2013-2014 indicated that over two thirds of students strongly agreed: that they received the help that they needed; that the staff was knowledgeable; that the information provided was helpful and clear; that the staff was courteous, and that the office setting was comfortable and clean.\(^{17}\)

The College recognizes that students who need to visit admissions, financial aid or the business office often need access to one or both of the other two. Thus, the Student Services Building (which opened in 2012) houses these three core services on one floor, and all three departments operate the same standard hours.

In spring of 2013, WLAC purchased and implemented a QLESS queuing system. This system allows students to “queue up” for admissions, financial aid or the business office virtually, either in person or online. Students who enter a phone number into the system receive periodic text updates, notifying the student of the wait time remaining until an in-person service can be delivered. Students with no phone may sign up by name. These three offices stay open later during the first two weeks of each semester. In the fall of 2013, they experimented with opening an hour early for the first three days of the semester (the busiest time of year).

Data from the QLESS system show that volume of services delivered and student wait times remain at relatively low levels for the first hour and a half of the extended schedule and then drop off towards the last hour. During the vast middle of the operating hours, service volume and wait times remain high relative to the beginning and end of each schedule. In other words, the data do not show a “spike” of students waiting to get in to the offices in the morning or rushing into the offices before they close. Instead, the biggest “spikes” occur throughout the rest of the operating hours:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Students Served, Admissions</th>
<th>Students Served, Financial Aid</th>
<th>Students Served, Business Office</th>
<th>Average Wait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30-9 a.m.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15-22 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 p.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15-27 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1 p.m.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41-141 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data show that it might be inefficient to direct resources towards a further expansion of operating hours considering the relatively low service and wait time volume at the beginning and end of each day. Rather than an expansion in the operating hours, students might benefit more from an increase in staffing resources placed in student services during the “core” hours of the schedule, particularly for financial aid.

**Evidence: Recommendation 6 of 2006**

1. 2009-2010 Program Review, Counseling, pages 11-15:  
   [http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/counseling.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/counseling.pdf)

2. Comprehensive Program Review, 2010, Division Self-Assessment of Progress  
   Linked with Planning Actions and Resource Requests, page 12 (EOP&S):  

3. West Los Angeles College Program Review Excerpts, 2012-2013, page 52:  

4. FPIP 2013-2014 List, Ranking Result of March 27, 2013, page 2:  
   [http://www.wlac.edu/fpip/FPIP%20Minutes%20February%2027-March%2027%202013-FINAL.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/fpip/FPIP%20Minutes%20February%2027-March%2027%202013-FINAL.pdf)

5. West Los Angeles College Program Review Excerpts, 2012-2013, page 98:  


7. Comprehensive Program Review, 2010, Division Self-Assessment of Progress  
   Linked with Planning Actions and Resource Requests, page 17:  

8. “Gov. Brown Signs Student Success Act of 2012 into Law, Ushering in Improvements at California Community Colleges”:  

9. SSSP April 2013 Bulletin:  


15 West Los Angeles College Fall 2013 Student Profile, page 2: http://www.wlac.edu/getattachment/Research-Planning/Research/College-Profile/Fall_2013_Student_Profile.pdf.aspx


2006 Recommendation 13

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.*)

Since 2012, WLAC has continued to make decisions using a stable and transparent shared governance structure. The Academic Senate and the College Council work in parallel, the first reviewing academic and professional matters defined by state law, and the second taking up other concerns. They consult on questions of mutual interest and host meaningful dialogue leading to timely decisions by the College as a whole. Measures focused on faculty participation have been particularly successful, including:

- Tracking committee participation by full-time faculty;
- Asking Divisions to account for committee participation in program review;¹
- Providing mentors to new faculty;²
- Instituting an orientation program for newly hired full-time and adjunct faculty (Faculty Professional Development Academy: West Connect).³

By contract, each full-time faculty member is required to participate in at least one committee, and with rare exceptions, they do.⁴

As part of a concerted effort to increase participation in governance, and in College activities in general, the College has instituted the practice of having co-chairs in every major College committee: one faculty member and one administrator. All College Council committees have membership that is representative of the College community, including faculty, administrators, staff and students.

Less quantifiable, but surely significant in the continuous effort to increase trust throughout the institution, is a sense of engagement across campus. Achieving the Dream (ATD) teams have drawn new participants and instituted semester “Kickoff” days that bring faculty to campus before classes start. The goal is to support students, but the event also fosters teamwork among faculty, staff and administrators. A key event in developing a WLAC esprit de corps was the Five-day Experiential Learning Institute (FELI) held in June 2013. Sixteen full-time and eight adjunct faculty and two administrators participated in the training session and emerged with a deeper understanding of the complexities of campus interpersonal relations. The FELI participants continued to meet monthly as a Community of Practice, and spearheaded a repetition of the program in August 2014; seventeen full-time and six adjunct faculty, three administrators, and three staff completed the second FELI. Flowing from the enthusiasm of the faculty who participated, a focused inquiry group (FIG) on Reading...
Apprenticeship met throughout the 2013-2014 year, and more FIGs began in the fall of 2014. The adjunct faculty who participated in the FELI have entered into the life of the College in new ways, serving on more committees and participating actively in the Faculty Inquiry Group on Reading Apprenticeship. Other events were designed with a special emphasis on classified staff. A showing of the film *Freedom Writers* was scheduled so that classified staff could attend, and supervisors were asked to permit staff to attend.

For the first time, a “Spring Summit” was held in January 2014. Specifically designed for the entire College (rather than just for faculty, who are required to attend the fall Flex Day), it focused on student success, provided a forum for dialogue, and offered an opportunity to discuss the new draft Strategic Directions for the new Educational Master Plan.

The key type of engagement pertaining to this recommendation is participation in governance. This is not only evidenced by participation in dialogue; it is fostered by the presence of meaningful dialogue that has an impact on decision-making. Participation in ATD has helped the College develop expertise in the focused use of data to improve student outcomes through coaching, workshop and conference participation, and especially in planning and instituting effective programs at WLAC:

- Semester Kickoffs
- Accelerated English
- Enhanced Tutoring
- Five-Day Experiential Learning Institute

Academic Divisions make reports at Academic Senate meetings, focusing on how they use assessment and dialogue to fine-tune programs that foster student success.

Invigorated by a sense of meaningful participation in the life of the College, staff and faculty have helped foster attitudes that reinforce the effectiveness of shared governance. The development of two master plans exemplifies the power of meaningful, timely dialogue to spark more participation in governance. Since 2012, the College has faced two major planning challenges: updating the Facilities Master Plan in the light of revised budgets and District procedures and creating an Educational Master Plan that could drive all other College plans. Both efforts have demonstrated an engaged governance structure.

In October 2011, as WLAC was gearing up to finish its building out to accomplish its facilities plan, the District imposed a moratorium on bond-funded building, discussed in connection with District Recommendation 1. The Facilities Committee had spent many hours of the 2010-2011 academic year crafting a solution to an earlier over-commitment of building funds, and its recommendations had been widely discussed and adopted.
Excavation had been completed for the single new building the College could afford. The District now required that the College not only show it could afford to build, using its allotment of bond funds, but also that the project still matched projected needs, and that the College could afford to maintain the completed building(s). The Facilities Committee got down to work. A new faculty member stepped up to replace the professor who, along with an administrative co-chair, had shepherded the 2010-2011 process. The College project manager and his staff conducted a detailed facilities assessment and cross-referenced it to District assumptions about College growth to identify areas of unmet needs over a twenty-year period. They gathered data from all programs to clarify the types of spaces that were needed, noting, for example, that the College had more large lecture spaces than it needed but lacked enough full-sized classrooms equipped for computer science instruction. In monthly meetings, the Facilities Committee scrutinized this information and accepted it. The Facilities Committee co-chairs presented the analysis to other campus bodies as it was developed. The discussions were not easy as the data relationships were complex and recent expectations were being frustrated. However, after reviewing the work, the Academic Senate, the Faculty Guild and its Work Environment Committee, together with the College Council, all eventually concurred with the analysis of the Facilities Committee and recommended that the College move forward with a greatly-modified plan, the 2013 Facilities Master Plan Update, which the Board of Trustees approved in January 2014.

The Facilities Committee is now overseeing the programming for two new buildings, together smaller than the project the College broke ground for in 2011, but much better aligned with the College’s needs for the next twenty years. For the second time in three years, the College has risen to the challenge of assessing its facilities needs in a well-understood and widely supported governance process.

The College has produced a new Educational Master Plan, intended to guide all further College planning. The planning agenda item in the 2012 Self-Study envisaged “the development of a new college master plan to reflect the components of the [2003] integrated master plan….” The College’s approach to planning has since shifted towards treating the Educational Master Plan (EMP) as the keystone of College plans, to which other plans align, rather than having it be one part of a master plan. Thus the Academic Senate indicated that the scheduled revision of the EMP should incorporate the Student Services Plan, and as the scope of this project became clear, it agreed to establish an Educational Master Plan Workgroup drawn from its Educational Policies and Standards Committee and from the PIE Committee. The College supported the Workgroup by providing release time for its faculty co-chair.
The Workgroup had its first meeting in April 2013, and met through July 2014\textsuperscript{21} to complete a draft EMP. A consultant guided the Workgroup through a meticulous process to:\textsuperscript{22}

- Evaluate the existing EMP
- Review the District strategic plan and its implications for the EMP
- Establish the initial scope, organization and contents of the EMP (reviewed periodically throughout its development)
- Review the relationship between the EMP and other plans, processes and standards
- Review and discuss internal and external evidence
- Develop and recommend a set of Strategic Directions
- Analyze campus feedback on these Strategic Directions
- Develop and recommend Goals and Objectives in support of the Strategic Directions
- Develop and recommend potential Action Plans, indicating responsible persons
- Consult with proposed responsible persons and revise proposed Action Plan;
- Determine contents of the EMP’s front and back matter
- Present the full EMP to shared governance bodies for review and approval
- Submit final recommended EMP to the college president

The Workgroup had selected its consultant in a formal RFP process and was ready for his approach to planning, which stressed facilitation of work \textit{by} the College itself rather than producing a plan \textit{for} the College. Workgroup members had significant “homework” between meetings, and often met in smaller groups to complete it. Actual Workgroup meetings were therefore substantive, with the minutes reflecting the respectful, informed, timely dialogue that is the ultimate goal of wide participation in governance. The resulting EMP has taken into account different perspectives and ideas.

The Workgroup began the 2013 academic year with the ambitious goal of completing the EMP so that it could be reviewed, discussed and adopted by the end of the academic year. This schedule had to be adjusted to accommodate a full discussion of the potential Action Plans, including consultation with the persons who would be responsible for carrying them out. The month of June was set aside so that this consultation could be thoughtful and thorough, and therefore the Workgroup met to recommend the full EMP only in July.

The full plan was presented to the College during the annual Professional Development Week \textsuperscript{(formerly called Flex Week), with two breakout sessions during the mandatory Professional Development Day, and an hour-and-a-half workshop titled, “Up Close and Personal with the New Educational Master Plan, Goals 1, 2, & 4.”\textsuperscript{23} The College Council noticed the draft EMP at its September meeting,\textsuperscript{24} as did the academic senate.\textsuperscript{25} Both bodies had approved the EMP by early October.\textsuperscript{26} The Institutional Effectiveness
Committee of the Board of Trustees has placed WLAC’s EMP on its December 17 agenda.27

Quantitatively, the degree of faculty, staff and administrator engagement in the governance processes for college master planning is reasonable: approximately 25 individuals attended EMP Workgroup meetings and 23 attended the Facilities Committee meetings dealing with the 2013 update. Nine served on both. The quality of the engagement is evident in the data reviewed, the minutes of the two committees’ deliberations, and in the minutes of the bodies that review their recommendations. During development, the both plans were so thoroughly discussed and understood at multiple venues that the College Council approved both plans by consensus.28

A final example of the ability of the College community to work together is the way the committee structure was adjusted to deal with the mandates of a new categorical program, Student Equity, and of the revamped Student Success and Support Program (SSSP). By late 2012, the Matriculation Advisory Committee had begun work on the SSSP plan required by the State Chancellor’s Office. Because of its new role in planning and the need to align with the EMP, the Accreditation Steering Committee recommended that the Matriculation Advisory Committee be redefined as an Academic Senate Committee.29 As the recommendation made its way through the shared governance process, it was noted that the SSSP planning template provided by the State Chancellor’s Office recommends an advisory committee structure for SSSP planning with a focus on broad stakeholder representation rather than the constituency representation used in WLAC’s shared governance committees. Furthermore, SSSP has many operational aspects that are best addressed by the vice president for Student Services.

The Enrollment Management Committee (EMC) crafted a solution. At the April 3, 2014 meeting of the College Council the EMC proposed overseeing the creation of a structure to house the planning for both SSSP and Student Equity. After extensive discussion,30 the EMC recommended the establishment of a new Student Equity, Access and Completion (SEAC) Committee along the lines of other shared governance committees reporting to the College Council, which would oversee Equity and Student Success Workgroups in creating and evaluating the two new plans.31 The role and charge of the new SEAC Committee is to work with the campus community to create a broad vision to improve access and achievement rates of at-risk students and to create a structure to promote College completion.
Evidence: Recommendation 13 of 2006

1. 2014-2013 Program Review Modules and Questions, Question 12.b: 

2. 2011-2014 Agreement between the Los Angeles Community College District and the 
   Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, Article 42.H, page 166: 
   Mentor Agreement, 2014-2015: 

3. Faculty Professional Development Academy: West Connect Flyer, fall 2013: 
   [http://www.wlac.edu/professionaldevelopment/west_connect/WestConnectFA13.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/professionaldevelopment/west_connect/WestConnectFA13.pdf) and 
   Faculty Professional Development Academy: West Connect Flyer, fall 2012: 
   [http://www.wlac.edu/professionaldevelopment/west_connect/WestConnectFA12.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/professionaldevelopment/west_connect/WestConnectFA12.pdf)

4. 2011-2014 Agreement between the Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, Article 32.II, page 135: 

5. Professional Learning Events, Focused Inquiry Groups: 
   [http://www.wlac.edu/Professional-Learning/Professional-Learning-Events/FIGs.aspx](http://www.wlac.edu/Professional-Learning/Professional-Learning-Events/FIGs.aspx)

6. Email Announcement of *Freedom Writers*: 

7. Spring Summit Program: 
   Spring Summit 2014: Educational Plan Workgroup Strategic Directions Worksheet, 
   “How does this Strategic Direction relate to your department or Function?”
   Spring Summit 2014: Educational Plan Workgroup Strategic Directions Worksheet, 
   “How do you envision applying this Strategic Direction to your work activities?”
Spring Summit 2014: Educational Plan Workgroup Strategic Directions Worksheet Summary:

8 ATDetails, Volume 2, Issue 1, September 2012:
ATDetails, Volume 3, Issue 1, September 2013:
ATDetails, Volume 4, Issue 1, September 2014:

9 ATDetails, Volume 3, Issue 4, February 2014, page 2:
Language Arts Division Meeting Minutes, March 17, 2014, Item XI:

10 ATDetails, Volume 2, Issue 3:
ATDetails, Volume 4, Issue 1, page 2:

11 Facilities Committee Minutes, October 6, 2013:
http://www.wlac.edu/bpmc/bpmc_minutes/FACILITIES%202011-10-6%20Summary%20_FINAL.pdf
Facilities Committee Minutes, February 6, 2012:
http://www.wlac.edu/bpmc/bpmc_minutes/FACILITIES%20MINUTES%202012-2-6%20FINAL.pdf

12 College Council Minutes, February 7, 2013, pages 2-3:
http://www.wlac.edu/Collegecouncil/CC-Final-Min-2-7-13a.pdf

13 2013 Facilities Master Plan Update, Part 2, Campus Space Study:

15 Facilities Committee Minutes, September 30, 2013:
http://www.wlac.edu/bpmc/bpmc_minutes/Facilities%20Committee%20Minutes%202013-9-30_Final.pdf

28 College Council Minutes, October 2, 2014, Item 5.a:  

29 Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes, January 13, 2014, page 2:  

30 College Council Minutes, May 1, 2014, 4:  

31 College Council Minutes, June 5, 2014, Item IV.A:  
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 (Standard III.B.1.a; III.D.2.a; IV.B.1.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

STATUS – RESOLVED
The ACCJC accepted the District’s activities in response to this recommendation on February 7, 2014, stating, “…LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2....”

DISTRICT ACTIONS LEADING TO RESOLUTION
When this recommendation was received in July 2012, the District was already in the process of improving its bond oversight and the fiscal integrity of the program; however, the visiting team identified areas needing improvement for the District to fully meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements.

The District had already formed an Independent Review Panel in April 2011. The Panel issued a report on the District's Building Program which included 17 recommendations covering diverse areas including: sustaining the maintenance and operations (M&O) cost of new buildings, training on ethical considerations, creation of an Executive Director of Facilities position, imposing a moratorium, modifying the college/district management structure, program costs and financial reporting, and handling of change orders.

The District submitted a Special Report on April 1, 2013, which described actions taken to address the Review Panel recommendations. Additional actions that the Chancellor and Board took included the creation of a Capital Construction Committee of the full Board to replace the three-member Infrastructure Committee; revision of reports to reflect more accurate college project budgets and forecasts; formation of a Board Ad Hoc Committee to consider additional policies related to oversight and control, and the creation of the Independent Office of Inspector General and Whistleblower Program.

A two-person ACCJC evaluation team visited the District Office in May 2013 and issued a report in which the team concluded that “…Tremendous progress has been made on the review of the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the moratorium that is being lifted in phases based on the merit of each project…”
The ACCJC’s formal response, dated July 3, 2013, concurred with the progress and asked for it to be solidified in a follow-up report:

…the District had conducted a thorough review of the Bond Oversight Structure including the formation of an Independent Review Panel, the hiring of a new District Executive Director of Facilities Planning and Development, and an evaluation of the Total Cost of Ownership for facilities…however…the District is continuing to implement the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel and is considering additional Ad Hoc Committees policies to strengthen bond oversight and control. The Report should identify continuing actions that ensure the District’s oversight of this construction program. 5

The District responded in October 2013, noting progress made and actions taken to address the Independent Review Panel’s recommendations.6

1. The moratorium, which allowed the District to step back and conduct a thorough evaluation to determine whether certain criteria had been met, was concluded.

2. The District created Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that incorporate industry standards as benchmarks to allow assessment of effectiveness of the centralized model.

3. The Board funded the District’s bond program reserve. Subsequently, projects underwent risk analysis to determine the adequacy of the set-aside. Reports are reviewed to monitor and mitigate potential risk and training on risk management is provided.

4. The reconciliation process developed as a result of this recommendation was institutionalized, with meetings held monthly.

5. Outside Construction Counsel reviewed the ten percent change order limit and concluded it was too restrictive. As a result, the Board planned to change the District’s change order policy to be consistent with other community Colleges in the state.

6. A Board Resolution restructured the bond program management to a more centralized approach.

7. The District developed and implemented an energy program headed by AECOM (the new bond program manager) which assessed the return on investment (ROI) of past projects and the use of remaining funds, including Prop 39, for future energy-related projects.

8. The District began upgrades to the Student Information System (SIS) and implementation of the CMMS (work and service order system) and the District physical one-card security...
9. A third delivery model, Lease-Leaseback, was introduced to allow “best value” selection, help minimize the number of change orders, and allow for contingencies during construction.

10. The District reviewed and updated existing procedures, revised where needed, and developed new ones for better oversight and control. New Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) were also established. The bond program management firm implemented Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) to improve outcomes related to quality, cost, and scheduling.

11. No further District action was required in the area of hard vs. soft costs.

12. The District received official acceptance of its methodology regarding compliance with Proposition 39 from the California State Attorney General.

13. The District restructured the District Citizens’ Oversight Committee (DCOC) to include a smaller group that utilizes industry experts, so it can ensure current industry standards are followed and the committee can function more effectively.

14. The District hired a new Facilities Executive Director (March 2012).

15. The Board hired a new program management firm, AECOM, a recognized industry leader in the field of project management. The District retained approximately one-third of the original program management staff to ensure a seamless transition.

16. The District conducted a study on long-term Maintenance and Operations (M&O) needs and reviewed benchmarks related to industry standards.

17. Ethical compliance training is conducted annually. Additionally, in August 2013, the Board of Trustees created the Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMP&OC), which replaced the Capital Construction Committee. This committee allows Trustees to research and evaluate facilities-related decisions more completely. The Whistleblower Program was also continued under the District’s Internal Audit Department, while the District released an RFP for a Bond Program Monitor.

**ACCJC AFFIRMATION**

Based on the District’s October follow-up report, the ACCJC responded in February 2014, verifying the resolution of Recommendation #1: “…The LACCD has provided
evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2 and met the associated Eligibility Requirements and Standards.”

**ONGOING PROGRESS**
The Board and the District have continued to implement the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel and additional Ad Hoc Committee policies to strengthen bond oversight and control.

**Building Program Management Structure**
The District has continued to refine its performance measures to ensure they incorporate industry standards and assess the effectiveness of its centralized model. The program manager has implemented Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that focus on quality, cost, and schedule. Monthly performance scores are evaluated and used to monitor the program’s progress as well as the performance indicators’ effectiveness in capturing the data and measuring the effectiveness of the building program.

**Program Reserve**
Projects have continued to undergo risk analysis to determine the adequacy of the bond program reserves and set-aside for anticipated and unanticipated costs. Risk management reports on each project continue to be reviewed by District program management in order to monitor and mitigate potential risks.

**Audit Update to Financial Reporting**
The District CFO and the Program Management Office continue the reconciliation process by meeting together monthly.

**Managing Change Orders**
Despite outside counsel’s original assessment that the District’s ten percent change order limit was too restrictive, further research showed that the District’s change order policy is consistent with other community Colleges in the state. Therefore, no revisions have been made to the District’s change order policy.

**Energy Program**
An energy program review and update was presented to the Board in August 2014.

**Audit and Evaluate Design Management**
Three delivery options for capital projects: 1) Design-Bid-Build; 2) Design-Build; and 3) Lease-Leaseback are being used for all three bond projects. The Lease-Leaseback option, added in 2013, minimizes the number of change orders and allows for contingencies during construction. The Board’s FMP&OC was presented with an update on the delivery options in June 2014. The majority of the remaining projects will use the Lease-Leaseback method.

WLAC 2015 Midterm Report: District Recommendation 1
Better Control of Construction Management
The new Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that resulted from a review of existing procedures are now web-enabled and available 24/7 to project and program stakeholders. All parties who need to use the SOPs have received training. All the fields have been audited against the SOPs. AECOM has initiated internal quality audits of the entire bond program and has already conducted a full round of audits for all campuses.

Review and Revise the District Citizens’ Oversight Committee (DCOC)
The Board made changes to the DCOC’s membership to improve its functioning. The restructured DCOC is a smaller group (reduced from 17 to 10) with a higher percentage of industry experts, four of whom have a strong construction background. The Committee meets quarterly. During the past year, the Committee shifted its focus to construction project review and spends much of its time reviewing and discussing construction/bond projects and bond audits. As the two-year terms for Committee members cycle through, it will be easier to evaluate whether increasing the percentage of industry experts has had a positive impact on the Committee’s effectiveness.

Building Program Management
The contract of AECOM, the program management firm hired in spring 2013, specifies deliverables designed to continue and enhance effective and responsible oversight and operation of the bond program. AECOM presented an overview of the District’s implementation of green, renewable and sustainable energy projects at the nine Colleges and its role in energy stewardship.

Impact of New Facilities on Long Term Operating Budgets
AECOM and Hickling and Associates LLC presented their findings and recommendations to the FMP&OC regarding the District’s custodial and building maintenance services. The presentation employed industry-based facilities performance indicators to compare District services and needs with similar-sized educational institutions. Recommendations focused on developing a centralized custodial deployment strategy, including central training and cleaning inspection programs, as well as standardized equipment, supplies, and products. It also suggested a standard set of performance metrics for reporting costs, staffing density, and service levels. A follow-up report explained how this mandate would be accomplished.

Ethical Considerations
Compliance training continues to be conducted annually for the staff. Three trainings were conducted in August 2014: Cost Principles Training, Program Labor Log Training, and The Color of Money. Training on conflict of interest is also conducted with District and College building staff annually.
On April 26, 2012, the Chancellor issued an interim directive mandating a conflict-of-interest checking process for the building program and directed the development of a comparable procedure for the District’s operational matters. The Conflict of Interest checklist is also requested from each member of the oversight committees on a biannual basis.25

In 2012, the District automated its Form 700 process through the implementation of the EDisclosure online portal. The District’s known designated filers are inputted and updated in the system. An annual filing notice is sent to all identified designated filers via e-mail in early March, approximately one month before the filing deadline of April 1. The Office of General Counsel (OGC) also runs reports in EDisclosure to determine which filers have not filed, and generates escalation messages accordingly. The Information Technology unit recently developed a link with the District’s payroll system to automate notifications when filers assume or leave office.26

To improve overall conflict of interest and Form 700 processes, the OGC has been meeting with other District administrators and building program staff (Form 700 Group) on a regular basis since 2012 and on a biweekly basis since fall 2013. The group’s work has focused in parallel on developing conflict-of-interest checking and on refining the e-filing and follow-up on Form 700s.

In winter 2014, the Contracts Unit implemented an updated flowchart, and a conflict-of-interest form comparable to the one in Chancellor’s Directive 152 has now been applied to all formal competitive processes.27 All contract ratifications pursuant to Procurement Policies and Procedures 04-05 through 04-08 include an affirmative step of checking for direct, financial conflicts of interest. In collaboration with the Form 700 Group, the OGC drafted a proposed Administrative Regulation, which will provide a narrative documentation of the procedure included in the attached flowchart. This Administrative Regulation has been circulated for final comments, and adoption was expected by the end of November 2014.

Conflict-of-interest training is included in the semi-annual Legal Crash Course presented for administrators, and it has been presented to the Educational Services Center Senior Staff. Supplemental stand-alone presentations have been made as requested by the Colleges.28

Additionally, all Trustees earned a certificate for completing training in public service ethics during June through October 2013.29

Additional Actions
The Board’s Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMP&OC) continues to review and evaluate Colleges’ Facilities Master Plans (FMPs). They have reviewed FMPs for LAHC and ELAC (August 21, 2013), 30 WLAC (November 20, 2013), 31
ELAC’s Firestone site (February 26, 2014), and LAPC (June 16, 2014) so far. The Committee will complete the review of the remaining five FMPs after appropriate internal review and planning.

Each College has developed a Strategic Execution Plan (SEP) for the final phase of its building program. The plans align remaining projects to remaining funds, standardize contingencies, address project risks, and confirm bond compliance. Each College’s SEP established a baseline for all remaining facility construction work and included a prioritization list for each College’s remaining projects. All Colleges developed and approved their respective SEPs between March 2014 and June 2014. The FMP&OC was presented with an update on the delivery options in June 2014. A presentation made to the Bond Steering Committee in July 2014 illustrated the Strategic Execution Plan process, a summary of remaining work at each College, and next steps.

Evidence: District Recommendation 1

1 ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014:
   http://www.laccd.edu/Departments/EPIE/PlanningAccreditation/Documents/ACCJC%20Letter%20to%20District%20Office_2-7-2014.pdf

2 Independent Review Panel Report, January 4, 2012:

3 Accreditation Special Report, April 1, 2013:

4 ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2013, District Recommendation 1 conclusion:

5 ACCJC letter, July 3, 2013, page 1:

6 LACCD Follow-Up Report, October 15, 2013, pages 4-7:
   http://www.laccd.edu/Departments/EPIE/PlanningAccreditation/Documents/LACCD%20Follow%20Up%20Report%20October%202013.pdf

7 Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Agenda, August 21, 2013, pages 9 and 11:

   Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Minutes, August 21, 2013, page 2:
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8 Request for Proposals for Bond Program Manager, September 16, 2013: 

9 ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014: 
http://www.laccd.edu/Departments/EPIE/PlanningAccreditation/Documents/ACCJC%20Letter%20to%20District%20Office_2-7-2014.pdf

10 Build LACCD CPM KPI Monthly Dashboard, June 30, 2014: 

11 District Program Management Services, Risk Management Overview, Director of College Facilities Report, July 10, 2014: 


James D. O’Reilly, Chief Facilities Officer, Los Angeles Community College District, Change Order Memorandum, June 16, 2014: 

13 District Program Management Office, District-Wide Energy Program Overview, August 20, 2014: 

14 Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee Minutes, June 25, 2014: 

James D. O’Reilly, Chief Facilities Officer, Memorandum to Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee, Summary of College Budget Recovery Plan Presentation to the Facilities June 25, 2014, June 17, 2014: 

15 Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Agenda, August 6, 2014, excerpt: 

WLAC 2015 Midterm Report: District Recommendation 1
Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Minutes, August 6, 2014, page 5:
http://www.laccd.edu/Board/Documents/2014-2015BoardMinutes/20140806-Board-
Minutes.pdf

16 LACCD Bond Program Web-enabled Standard Operating Procedures Instructions
Screenshot, August 22, 2014:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
Web-Enabled-SOPs.pdf

17 Board Rules, Chapter XVII, Rules 17002 and 17004:
http://www.laccd.edu/Board/Documents/BoardRules/ChapterXVII.pdf

18 District Program Management Office, District-Wide Energy Program Overview, August
20, 2014:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
AECOMEnergy-Presentation.pdf

19 Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee, Facilities Lifecycle Review, May
28, 2014:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
AECOMFacilities-Life-Cycle-Review.pdf

20 Custodial Services Enhancement Program, July 23, 2014:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
AECOMCustodial-Services-Enhancement.pdf

21 BuildLACCD Cost Principles Training, 2014:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
DistrictEvidence/Cost-Principles-Training.pdf

22 BuildLACCD Program Labor Log Training, August, 2014:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
DistrictEvidence/Program-Labor-Log-Training.pdf

23 The Color of Money, BuildLACCD Internal Procedures to Ensure the Correct Usage of
Funding Based on the Ballot Language Project List:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
DistrictEvidence/Color-of-Money.pdf

24 District Office of General Counsel, Kevin D. Jeter, Esq., Associate General Counsel,
Conflict of Interest Presentation, July, 2013:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
DistrictEvidence/CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST.pdf

25 Chancellor’s Directive 152, April 26, 2012:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/
DistrictEvidence/ChancellorsDirective152.pdf
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Camille Goulet, Memorandum on Form 700 Filings for the Building Program, November 4, 2014:

Conflict of Interest Flowchart updated Winter 2014:

Legal Crash Course presentation, Office of General Counsel, July 2013:
http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/DistrictEvidence/LegalCrashCourse.pdf

Public Service Ethics Education Online Proof of Participation Certificates: Trustee Svonkin, June 25, 2013:

Trustee Field, June 4, 2013:

Trustee Santiago, November 27, 2013:

Trustee Veres, July 29, 2013:

Trustee Moreno, October 9, 2013:

Trustee Pearlman, July 28, 2013:

Trustee Eng, July 21, 2013:

Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee Minutes, August 21, 2013, page 2:
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35 Strategic Execution Plan Presentation to the Bond Steering Committee, July 8, 2014: http://www.wlac.edu/WLAC/media/documents/WLACAccreditation/MidtermEvidence/DistrictEvidence/StrategicExecutionPlanBSC.pdf
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 (Standards III.D.2.a; IV.B.1.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

STATUS – RESOLVED
The ACCJC accepted the District’s activities in response to this recommendation on February 7, 2014, stating “…LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2…”

DISTRICT ACTIONS LEADING TO RESOLUTION
The District began addressing this recommendation immediately after receiving it in July 2012 and formally reported on its progress in a report submitted in April 2013. The ACCJC team noted in its May 2013 evaluation report, “Considerable progress has been made to resolve audit issues identified in the 2010 audit report…As a follow-up, the 2013 audit report should be reviewed as part of the normal financial review process to track the progress towards full implementation of all audit findings.”

Further progress was documented in the October 15, 2013 Follow-Up Report submitted to the ACCJC. The ACCJC accepted the District’s October 15, 2013 follow-up report at its January 2014 meeting, and this recommendation was considered resolved.

In order to address this recommendation, the District took the following actions:

CAPITAL ASSETS AND GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS:

1. Policies and procedures to reconcile capital asset expenses in the proper period in accordance with GAAP
   • Implemented additional controls and created a revised format and updated reconciliation procedure
     Fully resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.

2. Reconciling and reporting bond-funded furniture, fixtures, and equipment
   • Completed three phases (Asset Management, Radio Frequency Identification, Inventory and Asset Tracking)
Fully resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.7

3. Inadequate controls to reconcile possible conflicts of interest with vendor subcontractors
   • Purchased software for E-filing Form 700 Conflict of Interest
     Fully resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.8

4. Information Technology: Security and Change Management
   • Implemented Mercury Quality Center and Security Weaver and removed Super User Access
   • Moved SAP Basis and Security administrators to Security Weaver for management oversight and reporting
   • Staffed a full time Quality Assurance Analyst and implemented a new Self Service Password reset and SAP USER ID application
     Partially resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.9

FEDERAL FINDINGS:

1. Procedures were not in place to ensure proper monitoring of Financial Aid application verifications
   • Provided internal control procedures and quarterly reports to a quality assurance team
     Fully implemented and expected to be confirmed in the 2013-14 Audit in December 2014

2. Files for competitive grants for Worker Placement in High Growth and Emerging Industry Sectors were lost
   • Deployed a series of document-saving protocols
     Fully resolved as of December 2013.10

ACCJC AFFIRMATION
Based on the District’s October follow-up report, the Commission responded in February 2014, verifying the resolution of Recommendation 2: “The LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2 and met the associated Eligibility Requirements and Standards.”11

ONGOING PROGRESS
The 2012-13 Financial Audit (accepted at the December 11, 2013 Board meeting) verified that the District is in compliance on all of the financial issues. Only one finding remains, an IT Security and Change Management recommendation that has been partially implemented.12 Full implementation is expected to be confirmed in the 2013-14 Audit.
The District has made significant improvements over the past five years, reducing their financial audit findings from five to one, representing an 80% decrease. The District tracks its progress on implementing changes to address all audit findings and continues to conduct this tracking as part of its ongoing procedures. When there is an audit finding, the District conducts staff training as part of its corrective action plan.\textsuperscript{13}

**Evidence: District Recommendation 2**

\textsuperscript{1} ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014:  
http://www.laccd.edu/Departments/EPIE/PlanningAccreditation/Documents/ACCJC\%20Letter\%20to\%20District\%20Office_2-7-2014.pdf

\textsuperscript{2} LACCD Special Report, April 1, 2013, pages 11-15:  

\textsuperscript{3} ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2013, District Recommendation 2 conclusion:  

\textsuperscript{4} District Follow-Up Report, October 2013:  
http://www.laccd.edu/Departments/EPIE/PlanningAccreditation/Documents/LACCD\%20Follow\%20Up\%20Report\%20October\%202013.pdf

\textsuperscript{5} ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014:  
http://www.laccd.edu/Departments/EPIE/PlanningAccreditation/Documents/ACCJC\%20Letter\%20to\%20District\%20Office_2-7-2014.pdf

\textsuperscript{6} KPMG 2012-2013 Audit Summary Presentation to the Budget and Finance Committee, December 4, 2013:  

\textsuperscript{7} 2013-2013 KPMG Audit Letter, December 11, 2013, pages 86-89:  

\textsuperscript{8} KPMG 2012-2013 Audit Summary Presentation to the Budget and Finance Committee, December 4, 2013:  

\textsuperscript{9} 2013-2013 KPMG Audit Letter, December 11, 2013, pages 86-89:  
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Audit, December 11, 2013, page 118:

8 KPMG 2012-2013 Audit Summary Presentation to the Budget and Finance Committee, December 4, 2013:

2013-2013 KPMG Audit Letter, December 11, 2013, pages 86-89:

9 KPMG 2012-2013 Audit Summary Presentation to the Budget and Finance Committee, December 4, 2013:

2013-2013 KPMG Audit Letter, December 11, 2013, pages 86-89:

Audit, June 30, 2013, page 118-119:

10 Audit, December 11, 2013, page 110:

11 ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014:
http://www.laccd.edu/Departments/EPIE/PlanningAccreditation/Documents/ACCJC%20Letter%20to%20District%20Office_2-7-2014.pdf

12 Audit, December 11, 2013, page 88:

13 Financial Audit Training Participants, July 2013:
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).

DISTRICT ACTIONS LEADING TO RESOLUTION

At the time of the last self-evaluation report and visit to the Seaside Colleges in March 2012, the District was finalizing a thorough review of its budget allocation model. The process had been underway since May 2011, when the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC) began analyzing the District’s budget allocation formula, base allocations, use of ending balance policy, assessments for District Educational Services Center operations, enrollment growth targets, and College deficit repayment policies. After much review and deliberation, the District Budget Committee (DBC) approved the new budget allocation model, which was adopted by the Board on June 13, 2012.

The resulting model amended the original allocation methods (modeled on SB 361), to one with minimum base funding for Colleges. This new budget allocation model was phased in over a three-year period:

- Phase I increased the Colleges’ basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs based on square footage. The larger Colleges (East LA College and LA Pierce College) have received less revenue, but their reductions were phased in over a three-year period. The smaller Colleges benefitted by receiving more revenue in the first year. The new allocation model took into account both size and economy of scale when realigning funding between large Colleges and small Colleges. Phase I was implemented in the FY 2012-13 budget. Annual assessment of the allocation model and evidence of the changes to the maintenance and operations were included in the 2014-15 Final Budget.

- Phase II called for the ECDBC to study the remaining allocation agenda for potential allocation changes required to provide funding for the Colleges to deliver equitable
access for students, ensure that the Colleges are provided with sufficient funding to
achieve their missions, and to maintain quality instruction and student services. Phase II components include the following:

1) Growth Formula
2) Review the current use of balance policy
3) Assessments
4) Productivity and Efficiency
5) College Debts and Operating Deficits

The following are some of the activities completed by the District on Phase II:

**Considered Alternative Growth Funding Proposals** – In the time since the adoption of the new budget allocation model, the ECDBC has studied alternative growth funding formulas in response to Phase II of the formula. The Committee focused on considerations of population density, participation rate, and other factors in determining growth funding allocation. After studying various scenarios, the DBC approved to recommend the following changes in spring 2013 to the Chancellor. These changes were also presented to the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee in September 2013. These changes were

- 80% of available growth funds shall be used to restore College workload reduction until the Colleges are fully restored to their pre-reduction workloads
- 10% of available growth funds shall be distributed to Colleges based on each College’s share of the total LACCD underserved population
- 10% of available growth funds shall be used to fund Colleges based on the State model

However, in early 2014, work on potential changes to the District’s current growth funding formula was suspended due to the new proposed growth funding formula in the Governor’s 2014-15 Education Budget Trailer Bill. With the completion and implementation of Phase I, changes to the base funding allocation have created a more equitable system for the smaller Colleges. The ongoing activities that are part of Phase II will include the ongoing evaluation and continued improvements to the District’s Growth Funding Formula.

The District had planned to review the new model after three years (at the end of the FY 2015) to see if the formula is working to address the needs of the smaller Colleges. The DBC has already begun conducting an evaluation and is expected to complete it by the end of fall 2014.

**Approved a Balance and Reserve Policy** – On September 5, 2012, the DBC approved changes to the District Reserve and Balance policy as recommended by the ECDBC. The Chancellor received and approved the recommendation to maintain the general reserve at 5%; the contingency reserve at 5%; allow Colleges to keep their year-end balances up to 5% of their prior fiscal year’s unrestricted general fund budget (excluding
prior year balances); and allow Colleges to carry over their accumulated balances up to 10% of their prior year’s unrestricted general fund budget.11

On August 21, 2013, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Board of Trustees increase the general reserve level to 6.5% and reduce the contingency reserve to 3.5% of unrestricted general revenue for fiscal year 2013-14.12 The Board of Trustees adopted the 2013-14 Final Budget with these changes on September 11, 2013.13 The adjustment to these reserves was based on recent increases and decreases for these respective reserve funds. The combined total for both reserve funds remained at 10% of the overall budget.

Amended College Debt Repayment Policy – The DBC recommended to the chancellor that the District amend the College Debt Repayment Policy to:

- Limit the annual College debt repayment obligation to 3% of the College’s final budget allocation
- Create a policy for giving Colleges a method of receiving debt relief upon fulfilling certain conditions
- Suspend debt repayment for one year when a College has a new or interim president to allow him/her time to plan and address the College’s fiscal issues.14

The Board of Trustees amended the College Debt Repayment Policy upon recommendation by the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee on December 11, 2013.15

Passed new District Financial Accountability Measures to increase Productivity and Efficiency – These ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of Colleges within the District. These measures included operating standards, measurement criteria, and consequences/actions for Colleges that end their fiscal year in deficit.16

The District along with the Board of Trustees continues to review the fiscal health of the District and its nine Colleges. In August 2014, the Budget and Finance Committee reviewed the proposed Final Budget for 2014-15 with the Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer.17 This budget included some of the recommendations from Phase II.

The District continues to make significant strides towards improving its financial growth formula, balance policies and practices, assessment of financial resources, and College debt policies and practices to ensure Colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services.
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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).

DISTRICT ACTIONS LEADING TO RESOLUTION

In 2012, the District implemented a comprehensive Board development program. Training was held in February,\(^1\) April,\(^2\) and November of 2012. Topics included helping Board members distinguish their responsibilities from those of the Chancellor, understand their roles in setting policy, and develop goals and objectives.

To institutionalize its commitment to the principles conveyed at its retreats and trainings, the Board revised Board Rule 2300.10 (Code of Ethical Conduct) 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.”\(^3\)

In addition, the revised language affirms the Trustees’ pledge to avoid involvement in operational matters:

I will participate in the development of policy and the approval of strategy for the District and respect the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institution. I will avoid involvement in day-to-day operations.\(^4\)

Furthermore, the Board Rule states:

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.\textsuperscript{5}

As part of the District’s commitment to support and document the use of official channels of communication between the Board and staff, District staff instituted a policy on operational procedures and re-activated the use of an internal document tracking form for information requests from Board members. When a Board member requests further information on an issue before, during, or after a meeting, the Assistant Secretary to the Board sends a memo titled “Board Follow-up Items” to the Deputy Chancellor. The Deputy Chancellor then enters it on a form (Response to Board Member Inquiry) and adds it to a tracking document. Responses to inquiries of this nature are sent to the Board as part of a larger package of materials sent every two weeks in the Board packet.

During a Board meeting, as the Board considers matters contained on the Consent Calendar, those items for which Board members require clarification or further information are set aside. The Board President will ask for a vote on the remaining items and then recognize those Board members who require additional information. Once questions have been answered, the Board President will proceed with a vote on each of the items pulled from the Consent Calendar. However, any items requiring further information will be tabled until the information can be provided to the Board members so they can discuss the issue knowledgeably prior to a vote. Decisions made by the Board are based on full and open discussion of the issues.

In January 2013, the Board also revised Board Rule 2105 to encourage further training: “Within budgetary limits, Trustees shall be encouraged to attend conferences and other educational sessions regarding their responsibilities as Trustees.”\textsuperscript{6} Additionally, the Board of Trustees completed ethics training from June through October 2013.\textsuperscript{7}

The Board held a special meeting to discuss an Action Plan for Board Development.\textsuperscript{8} This meeting included a presentation on relevant accreditation standards and board policies conducted by Dr. Jerome Hunter of CSU Fullerton and the Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership and a discussion of the Board’s self-evaluation summary report.\textsuperscript{9} To guide its future course of action, the Board developed an actionable improvement plan at its annual retreat in spring 2013.\textsuperscript{10}

The Board followed a different process in 2013-14 for its evaluation than in previous years. In October 2013, ACCJC Associate Vice President Dr. John Nixon facilitated a goal-setting workshop to assist the trustees in setting their 2013-14 goals.\textsuperscript{11} He also reviewed Board roles and responsibilities.\textsuperscript{12}

In March 2014, the Board reviewed its goals and discussed achievements during an annual self-assessment session facilitated by external educational consultants Dr. Jose
Leyba and Thomas Brown. As a follow-up to that session, these consultants met with each trustee individually to flesh out the Board’s collective goals as part of the Board’s self-assessment. Trustees’ comments and concerns were compiled, reported in public session, and provided to the incoming Chancellor to ensure continued positive momentum.

On August 23, 2014, the Board and Chancellor met during a special meeting to discuss the Board’s goals, its committee goals, Board protocols, and the Chancellor’s vision and goals. The Board conducted a self-assessment of its progress in meeting the goals set in Dr. Nixon’s October 2013 workshop.

Evidence: District Recommendation 5
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Response to Self-Identified Issues

I.B.2 and II.A.2.f
The Planning Committee, together with the Academic Senate’s Student Success Committee, will apply Achieving the Dream’s focus on combining strategic improvement and data-driven decision making to improving students’ learning outcomes.

The Achieving the Dream (ATD) team reports success in conducting rigorous data analysis, identifying problem areas, and devising and executing interventions. The Student Success Committee houses the ATD effort, and the ATD Data Team provides extensive data support in the entire cycle, from initial analysis to evaluation of the interventions.

I.B.2
The Planning Committee will lead the development of a new college master plan to reflect the components of the integrated master plan and to align with the District’s current strategic planning efforts.

Early in 2012 the College reached a decision to situate the Educational Master Plan (EMP) as its key plan to which others would align, rather than creating a new integrated master plan. The draft EMP, which includes explicit alignment with the District strategic plan goals, has been approved through the shared governance process for Board consideration in December 2014.

I.B.3
Coordinated efforts by the Planning and Budget Committees will develop, propose and implement additional modified procedures to further strengthen linkage between program review, planning and budget.

WLAC’s planning and budgeting cycle links program review, planning and budget. It systematically includes joint Budget and PIE Committee evaluations of the cycle itself and of its effectiveness.

II.B.4
The Student Services Council will update the Student Services Plan for 2011-2016, including an annual summary of activities.

The EMP subsumes the SSP, including provisions for evaluation and updating the plan.
IV.A.3
The College Council will use a variety of data to inform strategies to address issues that contribute to low committee participation.

Academic Affairs and Academic Senate collaborated in producing a comprehensive account of faculty committee membership. These data have informed the actions described in response to Recommendation 13 of 2006. College Council recommended that all its committees have co-chairs and has evaluated the impact of this change.4

Evidence: Self-Identified Issues

1 ATD Annual Reflection, May, 2014, pages 5-6:
http://www.wlac.edu/studentsuccess/atd/atddocuments/West%20Los%20Angeles%20College%202014%20Annual%20Reflection%20Narrative%20Final.pdf

2 Draft Educational Master Plan, page 29:
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee/EMP_Pre-Draft_08-01-2014.pdf

3 Program Review Handbook, pages 80-81:

Update on Substantive Change in Progress, Pending, or Planned

WLAC will submit a Substantive Change Proposal to provide all instruction in the Police Orientation and Preparation Program (which leads to an AA degree) entirely off-campus at the LAPD Ahmanson Training Center.