Recommendation 1 – Measurable Goal Setting (2012)

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

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

Introduction

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

In January 2013, West embarked on a comprehensive revision of the college’s plans, intended to center college planning on educational excellence, to continue West’s tradition of open and transparent processes, and to result in measurable improvement to the college.

Educational Master Plan

In writing the 2008-2011 Educational Master Plan (EMP) the Academic Senate’s Educational Policies and Standards Committee (EPSC) made the decision to identify a limited number of specific goals on which the college should focus. The plan addressed West’s major strengths and weaknesses as revealed by ARCC data: for example, the college’s CTE programs exceeded the average level of achievement of colleges in its peer group, while basic skills outcomes were under par. As the Committee set out to produce a 2011-2014 EMP, the Dean of Planning and Research and the Chair of the EPSC devised an implementation matrix that the Committee
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used to assess progress towards achieving the goals of the 2008 plan. Discussions of the matrix by constituency representatives at committees, including the Planning Committee,\textsuperscript{12} contributed to the development of the 2011 plan. While most of the major components in the 2008 plan were retained, significant changes arose from the discussion of the assessment results. For example, on the matrix it had been noted that the strategy, “require all students to participate in comprehensive orientation and assessment before class registration,” did not conform to the California Education Code, which at that point prohibited requiring orientation or assessment before registration, so the strategy in the 2011 EMP reads, “Strongly encourage all students to participate in comprehensive orientation and assessment before class registration.” The 2008 objectives were clarified as goals, and the objectives as strategies. For each 2011 strategy, implementation specifics, facilitators, and measures of achievement are now specified. Objective 2 of the 2008 had called for a “comprehensive, integrated written plan for an effective basic skills program.” With the adoption of a Foundation Skills Plan in March 2011\textsuperscript{13}, the 2011 EMP Goal 4 focuses on implementing the written plan and assessing the impact of its objectives.

Both iterations of the EMP followed the same path to adoption:, the EPSC recommended each plan to the Academic Senate\textsuperscript{14}, which after deliberation made a recommendation to the College President. The College President accepted the Academic Senate’s recommendation to adopt each plan.

Following the example of the EMP, major plans identify measurable goals at the implementation-specific level. For example, the Foundation Skills Plan envisioned that “Some courses are centered around term-long projects to be presented and celebrated at the end of term.”\textsuperscript{15} West met that goal by establishing student poster fairs in spring of 2012.\textsuperscript{16} The college’s Achieving the Dream (AtD) Implementation Proposal of May 2012,\textsuperscript{17} developed by the Student Success Committee\textsuperscript{18} in conjunction with the Academic Senate,\textsuperscript{19} selected AtD strategies that align with the EMP. The Implementation Proposal established that the Academic Senate’s Student Success Committee would oversee AtD work to ensure that it is systematically evaluated and contributes to long-term institutional improvement. The planning process included an extensive review of data and resulted in identified baselines and targets for goals.\textsuperscript{20} With the adoption of this proposal, the college is now able to gauge improvements in institutional effectiveness more accurately with respect to these goals. In fall 2012, the following AtD plans were fulfilled:

- Welcome Day (College Kickoff)\textsuperscript{21}
- Faculty Inquiry Groups\textsuperscript{22}
- Student Poster Showcase
- Leadership Retreat\textsuperscript{23}
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As the next step in the ongoing cycle of improvement in educational master planning, work on a comprehensive revision of the EMP has begun. On January 14, 2013, the College President chaired a meeting in which he called for the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Academic Senate’s EPSC to collaborate on a revision of the EMP, using analysis of program reviews, other planning processes, regional demographic information and other environmental scan results, advisory committee input, and the mission and goals of the California Community Colleges, Los Angeles Community College District, and West Los Angeles College. Measurable goals and criteria for gauging progress are to be built into the design of the Plan. The college continues to recognize the need to treat the EMP as the keystone of college plans. The Student Services Plan will be subsumed into the EMP, and the EMP goals will guide facilities and technology planning.²⁴

**Student Services Plan**

The vice president of Student Services and the deans of Student Services devised the 2007-2011 Student Services Strategic Plan in support of the EMP. In this plan, strategies generally consisted of discrete tasks, implying that they were either done or not done. The 2007-2011 plan listed six goals, each with multiple objectives and strategies. The strategies were cross-referenced to the Technology Plan, the Basic Skills Plan and, especially, the Educational Master Plan. Furthermore, the plan provided a responsible agent or department and an attainment date for each strategy. The 2007-2011 Student Services Plan was a living document, as evidenced by the revision in November 2008, and update in October 2009 which incorporated a summary of activities for 2007-09. The division indicated which strategies had been completed, frequently breaking down completion into a series of milestones. Out of 78 strategies, 65 had been completed by February 2010.²⁵

The Student Services Division revised the plan (now the 2011-2017 Student Services Plan) in deliberations in 2011²⁶ and early 2012,²⁷ and solicited feedback from all Student Services faculty and staff at the March Student Services Council meeting as well as by e-mail. The vice president incorporated this feedback into the plan before it was adopted in October of 2012.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL 1: Decrease the number of applicants who never enroll in the college by streamlining the enrollment process.</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL 1: Increase the percentage of students that use existing self service options and enhance the quality of those services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> Reduce the number of applicants that never enroll to the college.</td>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> Increase the number of students using self-service options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL 2: Help student identify career interests and goals so that they can declare a major no</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL 2: Help student identify career interests and goals so that they can declare a major no</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Later than the end of their first year at West.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> Reduce the number of undecided students by 5% every year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Later than the end of their first year at West.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2:</strong> 5% of students who were initially undecided on their major will declare their major at the end of their first year at West.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 5:** Enhance the academic preparedness of pre-collegiate students.

- **Objective:** Provide support services to address academic preparation and student success.

**Goal 5:** Explain and enforce critical Title 5 and Financial Aid policy changes that impact student progress and success.

- **Objective:** Educate students on critical policy changes. Enforce Title 5 and Financial Aid policy changes.

**Goal 6:** Increase the awareness and utilization of student services programs.

- **Objective:** Effectively market the student services programs offered on campus.

**Goal 6:** Create and strengthen partnerships with community organizations to enhance on-campus support services for students.

- **Objective:** Effectively market the community organizations on campus to enhance student participation.

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

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

**Technology Master Plan**

As the visiting team of March 2012 noted, the 2009-2016 Technology Master Plan (TMP) did not state its goals in measurable terms. In February 2012 the Technology Committee had set up several workgroups to refine the existing implementation matrices for each TMP goal. In September the committee added the task of defining measurable outcomes to each workgroup’s charges. At that time the Dean of Research and Planning assisted the Committee in defining measures so that progress on the goals of the plan can be assessed. Workgroups agreed to identify at least one strategy with associated measures of achievement for each goal of the TMP. By January 2013 measures had been devised to assess progress on six of the seven goals, and were included on drafts of the implementation matrices. At its February 2013 meeting, the Technology Committee will review the measures for all the goals and recommend them to the College Council for adoption.
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With assistance from a consultant, the committee also recognizes the need to fully update the TMP with concrete milestones, timelines and responsible persons.

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

The 2010 Facilities Master Plan continued the nine facilities goals of the IMP:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- An architect conducted a review of existing spaces and correlated them to state standards for community colleges.
- He took into account Academic Affairs’ review of its scheduling data, attending to conflicts in high-demand time slots and for specific types of instructional spaces.
Recommendation 1 – Measurable Goal Setting (2012)

- He consulted the facilities needs report generated from 2012 program reviews.\(^{38}\)

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

While overseeing this time-critical process, the Facilities Committee is also working to refine facilities planning. In July of 2012 it formed a workgroup to establish measurable outcomes for the broader goals in the Facilities Master Plan update. The group developed a matrix including measures of achievement and progress towards each goal, as well as relationships with Educational Master Plan goals and objectives.\(^{39}\) Work continues, including using the data produced in the Program Review process to measure progress on facilities.\(^{40}\) The Facilities Committee is also working to consolidate, update, and specify the goals in the various facilities planning documents.

At the conclusion of these facilities planning processes the College will produce the following:
- A California Environmental Quality Act compliance action, either a supplement to the existing EIR or a negative declaration attesting to no environmental impacts; and
- A modification to the Settlement Agreement with the City of Culver City establishing a new timeline and incorporating other changes in response to the new master plan.

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

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

Since its adoption in 2008, the EMP has been the lead plan at West Los Angeles College. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee evaluates requests for new resources based in part on their linkage to the EMP, and the Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization Committee does not consider new positions unless they, too, are linked to the EMP, via program review. In addition, program review guides respondents to report on how well their programs meet the goals of the EMP, and to set related goals at the unit level.
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college recognizes the need to use its established deliberative processes to create a new EMP that can guide other college plans, and to identify mechanisms to measure progress towards all identified college goals.

See also the Recommendation 2 section for coverage of integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and evaluation through the program review cycle.

5 http://www.wlac.edu/masterplan/documents/WLACStudentServicesPlan20112016.pdf
7 Divisional Council Minutes: http://wlac.edu/divisionalcouncil/agendas_minutes.html
8 Mark’s spreadsheet correlating grant opportunities with college plans.
9 Reported at PIE Committee Jan. 23, 2013 cite minutes.
   http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/TRIS/Research/Accountability/ARCC/ARCC%202007.pdf
11 http://wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee_documents/PCMin-11-28-2011.pdf This is a mention of the matrix at the Planning Committee; Rebecca is looking for the actual matrix.
12 http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee_documents/Planning_Committee_Minutes_10-26-09.pdf
13 http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee_documents/Planning_Committee_Minutes_9-28-09.pdf
15 http://wlac.edu/studentsuccess/AtD%20Mtg%20minutes%203-13-120001.pdf
16 http://wlacpostershowcase.weebly.com/goals-and-overview.html
17 AtD proposal: http://wlac.edu/studentsuccess/atd/atddocuments/West_ATD_Implementation_Proposal.pdf
18 March Student Success minutes: http://www.wlac.edu/studentsuccess/AtD%20Mtg%20minutes%203-13-120001.pdf
19 March 23 2012 Senate Minutes:
20 March 13 2012 Senate Minutes:
22 needs documentation—meeting notes, AtD newsletter?
Draft, Feb. 1, 2013
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24 There are notes for the Jan 14 meeting, correct?
26 needs documentation, perhaps from SSC minutes
27 needs documentation, perhaps from SSC minutes
29 needs documentation—minutes of Tech Cmte?
30 needs documentation—minutes of BPMC, 2010-2011
31 [http://www.wlac.edu/DEIR/toc.htm](http://www.wlac.edu/DEIR/toc.htm)
32 [http://www.wlac.edu/DEIR/Chapter%202%20Project%20Description.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/DEIR/Chapter%202%20Project%20Description.pdf)

33 needs documentation
34 meeting notes?
35 moratorium document?
36 Peter’s reports
37 Karen’s reports
38 PR facilities needs report

40 [http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr1213-Reports.html](http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr1213-Reports.html)

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

**Introduction**

West has been engaged in program review since 1999, steadily improving its process over time. The process is now fully online, with significant data provided for the authors—program review managers and program review team members. It integrates with resource allocation through a process that is grounded in West’s established structures of participatory governance. A revision of the instrument systematically precedes each round of program review.¹ In 2012 this revision focused on including measurable goals for each program and using them to assess progress. Improvements for the 2012-2013 cycle include fuller data collection and analysis, especially in assessing the effects of resource allocations; more robust validation and prioritization, both guided by rubrics; and the evaluation of these changes at the end of the 2012-2013 fiscal and academic year. Definitions of terms have been added to the Program Review Handbook; definitions were reinforced during program review workshops; and definitions were further clarified through the validation process.²

**A History of Campus-wide Reflection**

Since 1999, West has conducted program reviews for all programs in the Student Services, Academic Affairs and Administrative Services Divisions. Administration, staff and faculty all participate in program review; depending on the program being assessed, the responsibility for writing the program review falls to administrators (principally deans), staff (mostly program managers) and faculty (chairs of instructional divisions, regular faculty and adjunct faculty). Requests for new resources originate in the planning sections of program reviews. Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization process (FPIP), a well-developed and well-accepted process under the purview of the Academic Senate, considers only faculty positions that have been previously identified in program review and linked to the goals of the Educational Master Plan.³

In 2008, program review moved to an electronic platform, using a web-based software developed by a consultant.⁴ For the 2010 cycle, the Program Review Committee evaluated the previous process and decided to use a different system, including revised questions while retaining the basic program review process.⁵ The 2010 cycle collected responses using PDF forms from which the Office of Research and Planning could create a database and produce reports. The program review instrument required that program goals explicitly link to institutional goals and to program assessment results, including SLO assessments. Action plans were linked to program goals. Program review authors indicated for each action whether additional resources would be required, and resource requests followed from that indication. The instrument also elicited the impact of each action on other programs.⁶ A validation process followed the submission of program reviews, and validators returned some program reviews to areas for changes and further editing. These program reviews were then re-submitted for

additional validation until they were approved by the validators. Following this, a prioritized list of all the requests fed into the budget development process.7

The quality of submitted program 2010 reviews was uneven, as the 2012 evaluation team noted. The planned 2011 program review cycle was modified, and called for program reviews to be conducted in spring rather than fall. Thus, the spring 2011 program reviews consisted of updates.8 For the 2012-2013 cycle, West returned to doing program review in the fall, and inaugurated a new program review platform, the district’s Institutional Effectiveness System (IES).

IES: A Milestone in Program Review Integration
In late 2008 a College Collaborative Taskforce involving faculty and researchers from all nine LACCD colleges, and chaired by West’s Dean, Office of Research and Planning began work on identifying and developing online software to support planning and program review. After investigating commercially-available software and finding none that met identified needs, the taskforce began working with district IT to add an online program review to the other district-wide applications supported by the SAP software that runs many of the district’s information systems. The taskforce worked closely with district IT to design modules that allow faculty, staff and administration to work together online in the creation, validation and use of program reviews.9 In the fall of 2012, West was the first college to use the new district Institutional Effectiveness System (IES) application. The IES facilitates collaboration and discussion:

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

The system is flexible, allowing for the addition of components; a place holder now indicates where SLO assessment results will be accommodated in subsequent development. The software was developed with the understanding that major updates will be made on at least an annual basis. The first meeting to plan next steps in software development was held in January 2013.10

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee and the 2012-2013 Cycle
The Planning Committee and the Program Review Committee used its annual review of the program review process to prepare for the inauguration of IES, as well as to address the recommendations of the 2012 evaluation team.11 In September 2012 the College Council reorganized the two committees as a single Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE)

Committee.\textsuperscript{12} Like its predecessors, the PIE Committee has broad representation, including faculty, administrators and staff. The College Council will determine the exact membership structure in February 2013; student participation will be sought.\textsuperscript{13} In support of its work in overseeing the college’s planning and other processes designed to improve institutional effectiveness, the PIE Committee is charged with coordinating program review and with using the results to provide the Budget Committee and the College Council with allocation recommendations. Another of its responsibilities is to “systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the program review process, recommend improvements, and coordinate implementation of approve improvements.”\textsuperscript{14}

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

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

A major addition to the program review process in 2012 was a review during the validation phase of data related to program viability.\textsuperscript{15} The program viability process defined by the Academic Senate specifies certain data, already reported and responded to in program review, that may indicate the need for a program viability study.\textsuperscript{16} The program viability process has not been used in the past. With the addition of a review of viability indicators, two programs have requested viability studies of their programs.\textsuperscript{17}

With each program’s evidence-based assessment of progress on its own previously-identified goals, of the effects of prior resource allocations or lack thereof, and of learning and other applicable outcomes, program review now anchors an ongoing cycle of planning, evaluation, improvement, and re-evaluation aimed at systematically enhancing student learning and institutional effectiveness.
To prepare the college community to use the IES system, the dean of Research and Planning conducted five workshops and provided a Program Review Handbook online and in hard copy. Sections of the Handbook were also used in hands-on activities at the November 2012 Leadership Retreat. In addition to documenting the use of the software and the revised instrument, the Handbook outlines all the steps of the program review process:

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

In addition to introducing the IES software, workshops addressed stressed the role of validation in ensuring the quality of program reviews, as well as the role of program reviews in such planning processes as developing unit goals defined in such a way that progress can be evaluated, resource allocation and program viability.

A dean in the Office of Instruction wrote about the 2012-2013 program review cycle,

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

The Language Arts Division used Etudes (the college’s online course management system) as a supplement to division meetings to facilitate faculty participation in and dialogue about the division’s program review.

The revised program review process improved not only dialogue within divisions, but also the validation of program reviews; in the winter of 2012-2013, validations were done by teams, guided by a detailed set of questions. Examples of the questions used to guide validation include:

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

Program reviews were returned for revision when they did not provide the required levels of information or analysis. Over 40% program reviews were returned at least once for revision. Although the IES’ term for returning a program review for revision—“rejection”—may have been unfortunate, the process did foster dialogue. For example, the Language Arts Division program review was initially rejected because it was incomplete, in part because the authors had overlooked some fields. In revising it, however, they also recognized gaps in facilities needs identification, which they corrected and which then entered into the facilities needs assessment process noted in Recommendation 1.

Teams of deans working together on validations gained valuable insight; for example, the dean of Teaching and Learning worked with a dean in the Office of Instruction to validate the Mathematics Division’s program review, providing added clarity on the division’s SLO process. As stated in the validation comments for this program review, “Some Math classes had existing SLO's but now all courses have identified SLO’s, assessment methods and criterion levels. Each course will be assessed in the Fall 12 semester and will be analyzed. This division is very data driven in its decision-making, and planning.”

In a pilot of cross-area validation, validators from Student Services and Academic Affairs together worked on the program reviews for allied health, transfer and matriculation. Validation was so intensive that it required deadline extensions, and finished at the beginning of February.

In the development of the 2013-2014 budget, program reviews provide all requests for new resources. The because of the delay in validation, each vice president will review his division’s

requests and provide a prioritized list to the PIE Committee in February. On a parallel track, the PIE Committee was able to use a mixture of validated and draft program reviews to advance the broader planning process. At its January 23, 2013 meeting the PIE Committee continued its work of producing a prioritization rubric for resource requests, based on the college’s Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services. Thus, the vice presidents have a draft rubric to consider as they produce their rankings, and the PIE Committee is on track to complete its prioritization on schedule, March 6, 2013. In April the College Council will review the resulting list and make its recommendations to the college president, who will make the final decision on the priorities which will guide the preparation of the 2013-2014 budget.

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

In 2013 the PIE and Budget Committees inaugurated a process of twice-yearly joint meetings. The first of the two meetings, designed to focus on effective utilization of financial resources, is scheduled for February 21, 2013 (The other will be held in July 2013 to evaluate the planning cycle itself.) The committees use numerous sources of information to evaluate the effective use of financial resources in the 2011-2012 budget, and the 2012-2013 allocations for which preliminary data is already available. These sources include the following:

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

The first meeting envisioned as part of this new process occurred at the PIE Committee meeting on January 23, 2013, where the first set of data was discussed. The committee discussed draft reports generated from program review responses that can inform an assessment of the effective utilization of financial resources. The reports are posted at the program review web site, and include:

- Impact of Resource Allocation on Unit
- Impact of Potential 5% Budget Cut on Unit
- Assessment of Progress in Meeting Prior Goals
- Unit Goal Outcome Measures
- SLO Assessments and Changes

The PIE Committee plans to prepare a summary of program review data for presentation to the Joint Committee Meeting, along with the other data called for in the plan. A further outcome of the 1/23/13 meeting was identification of areas of improvement needed in the program review process and document. As preparation for the systematic review to be conducted in July 2013, notes about these areas are specifically maintained to facilitate that evaluation.32

At the Joint Meeting to be scheduled in July, 2013,33 the two committees will complete their evaluation of the 2012 program review process, update it and set the calendar for the 2013 process. In fall 2012 the college had engaged a consultant who reviewed planning and program review procedures for cohesion, incorporation of existing policies, and meaningful evaluation. The PIE Committee will use this list in their evaluation of the 2012 program review process.34 This document and other evaluation already underway suggests areas for improvement, including clarifying program review instructions, providing the validation and prioritization rubrics to the program review authors before program review begins, including the president’s office in program review, and clarifying the definition of a program.35

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

The PIE Committee is also charged with guiding the college, through the appropriate committees, in evaluating progress towards the goals of the Educational Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, Student Services Plan, and Facilities Master Plan, in part by using the results of program review. As noted under Recommendation 1, for example, the Student Services Plan has been updated twice since 2007, partially in response to issues identified in the program reviews of the Division.36

---

2 Documentation – Validation example where the validator returned a program review because ‘Unit Goal’ was misunderstood.
3 FPIP Policy: http://www.wlac.edu/academicsenate/documents_2011/FPIP%20POLICY%20effective%20April%202014%202009.pdf; additional documentation—FPIP forms and rubrics
4 Reports generated by the first online program review system: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr0910.html
5 Program Review Subcommittee Proposal: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr0809_docs/PRS_Proposal-5-1-09.pdf
7 Vice Presidents’ Priority List: http://www.wlac.edu/budget/VPPriorityList8-8-10.pdf

9 College Collaborative Program Review Taskforce Minutes:
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pro_taskforce.html

10 IES Planning Agenda: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/IES_next_steps_2013.pdf

11 PIE Committee Minutes: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee.html


13 http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/Draft_Proposal_Merge_Committees.pdf (should be the final version—this is the proposal.

14 Documentation – Statement about the program viability indicators, and the PIE minutes where the process was adopted

15 Documentation – Academic Senate Program Viability Policy and Procedure

16 Documentation – cite program reviews of HLRC and Applied Technology


19 need an evaluation of the LR online.

20 here we need to cite a report on the numbers of PRs submitted, the number returned, and—if possible—some of the improvements made through the validation process.

21 this is in the timeline, but if it did not happen, I guess we should remove the sentence. If it did, provide the lists.

22 needs minutes for the Jan. 23 PIEC, the approved prioritization list, and the revised Principles for Prioritization.


http://www.wlac.edu/academic senate/FPIP%20positions.pdf

24 http://www.wlac.edu/academic senate/documents_2011/FPIP%20POLICY%20effective%20April%202009.pdf

25 Documentation – see if there are minutes from Lisa

26 Joint PIE-Budget Committee Meetings:
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/Joint_Budget_PIE_Committee_Meetings.pdf

27 Documentation – PIE minutes

28 Documentation – Budget Committee minutes

29 Focused program review reports: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr1213-Reports.html

30 Documentation – PIE minutes, 1/23/13

31 Documentation – link to web site with reports

32 Documentation – Agyeman's notes

33 This should be in the College Council minutes for September, when they approved the merger—if it's in a missing attachment, I think it’s in the PIEC minutes

34 MCL's list on planning and PR

35 needs Jan and Dec minutes from PIEC, perhaps also a report from ORP on problems reported by authors.

36 this could use a citation from a SS program review, with the corresponding change to the SS Plan
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.)

Introduction

In its first decade working with Student Learning Outcomes, West Los Angeles College implemented a cycle of SLO identification, assessment, discussion, and improvement. The project, initially faculty-led, expanded steadily with the assistance of significant resources including dedicated administrators and staff. In 2012, the college has taken additional steps to improve its SLO cycle by committing to focus on course-level SLOs and engaging in further work on completing the cycle of assessment, dialogue, and improvements. The college has made further planned steps in refining the connection of the SLO processes to Program Review by incorporating SLO data into the Program Review process.

Establishing a System of SLO Assessment, 2002-2012

At the root of West’s SLO cycle was a college-wide agreement on Institutional SLOs initially identified by instructional faculty and subsequently adopted by non-instructional programs as well.¹ Progress was incremental, as early adopters modeled SLO assessment, the AFT Faculty Guild and the Board of Trustees clarified full- and part-time faculty obligations in the contract, and the Planning and Program Review committees modified instruments to fold SLO assessment into planning.² Questions were added to Program Review to capture assessment plans, changes made as a result of assessment, and if changes would require a resource request. In addition, faculty indicate if a planned goal was developed as a result of outcomes assessment.³ Participation was both broad and deep: dozens of faculty participated in workshops focused on Institutional and Program SLOs and more identified the roles of these SLOs in their courses; faculty and administrators sought out expert advice at state and local meetings. West allocated faculty release time for an SLO Coordinator and administrative support⁴ to shepherd the institutionalization of the SLO assessment cycle.

West began working on defining and assessing Student Learning Outcomes in November 2002, when faculty and administrators attended a Student Learning Outcomes Workshop⁵ led by the Research and Planning Group (RP Group). The college formed an SLO Committee in spring
2003,\textsuperscript{6} which led a group of faculty in identifying Institutional SLOs by November 2004. Groups of faculty from disparate disciplines met together and discussed what they expected students to be able to do as a result of taking their courses. They then sorted the resulting course outcomes into logical groups and discussed what they held in common. The resulting broad descriptions of what faculty expected students to be able to do became the first draft of West’s Institutional SLOs.\textsuperscript{7} In identifying Institutional and Program SLOs, planners maintained the connection to specific course outcomes. To identify Program SLOs, faculty typically began by listing the critical outcomes of the courses that made up the program. Continued workshops helped faculty align course objectives and assessment tasks with program and institutional SLOs. Program SLOs were applied to the specific courses for which they were developed.\textsuperscript{8}

In 2006, the college began an SLO Portfolio Project\textsuperscript{9} to capture SLO assessment, with about 25% of the faculty starting the project each year through 2009. Focusing on key courses, instructors created (or identified existing) lessons focusing on a specific program SLO, developed a rating scale for the work students produce as a result of these lessons, and posted model student work illustrating A, B, C, D, and F levels on the SLO being assessed. The student work being assessed could be an assignment that counted towards the course grade, but in such cases applying the rubric developed for the SLO helped the instructor focus on that SLO, separate from other factors affecting the course grade. Instructors posted reflections stating what they learned during the process and what they might change the next time they taught the course. Through this ongoing, systematic review, West calibrated grades on individual assessments (essays, quizzes, speeches, art projects, etc.) with SLO achievement, thus showing how faculty evaluate student achievement. Faculty were prompted to use the results of this process to help more students achieve their SLOs. The resulting cycle (design, develop, pilot-test, evaluate, modify, and--if necessary--test again) allowed for continuous improvement, both in instruction leading to student achievement of SLOs and in the assessment process itself. Faculty from 34 disciplines assessed 60 classes in this way. Improvements and changes as a result of assessment were reported in Program Review.\textsuperscript{10}

West described its SLO assessment procedure in its 2009 \textit{Focused Midterm Report}.\textsuperscript{11}

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

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

Three faculty members attended the WASC and AAHE conference held in Hawaii from January 28-30, 2010 and returned energized to continue this process, focusing particularly on faculty dialogue on assessment results, leading to improved teaching and learning.12

Over the course of his work, West's original SLO Coordinator achieved statewide prominence. For example, at the 2009 Student Success Conference the RP Group honored West’s SLO Coordinator for his SLO work with a POWER (Promising Outcomes Work and Exemplary Research) Award.13 He also served on the SLO Assessment Guidelines Ad Hoc Committee that wrote Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment that was adopted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in fall 2010.14 West’s first SLO Coordinator retired in June 2010.

In February 2011, a new SLO Coordinator was hired. He participates on the district-level SLO Advisory Committee and serves as Co-Chair of West’s SLO Committee. He spearheaded expanding the scope of SLO development, review and revision beyond the previous focus on academic SLOs to include all divisions and programs in the college, including a systematic approach to the SLO cycle.15 To support this wider sweep, the college created an SLO taskforce (which evolved into an SLO Committee reporting to the Academic Senate through the Curriculum Committee) with representatives16 from the three major divisions of the college (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services). The SLO Coordinator is a resource to the Curriculum Committee on technical review of courses, and reports at all Academic Senate meetings on SLO progress.17

In August 2011, the college hired a Dean of Teaching and Learning. Part of her responsibilities include providing leadership over SLOs, supervising the SLO Coordinator, and co-chairing the SLO Committee.18

West continued to fine-tune its SLO assessment cycle. In 2011, the Senate approved assessment tools that faculty could use to more easily assess student learning outcomes for courses and programs, and that also clearly aligned courses with both Institutional and Program SLOs.19 The new SLO Coordinator held one-on-one training sessions and workshops20 with faculty, and the SLO Committee mounted an extensive video tutorial on the college website.21 The website also features the SLO Coordinator’s focused and comprehensive reports22 on all course SLO work completed to date, including graphics23 conveying the work for the path to proficiency. The SLO Committee also developed and distributed a Year-in-Review 2011-2012
report\textsuperscript{24} that included SLO History and Assessment Plans, SLO Reports, SLO Process Diagrams, SLO Assessment, SLO Committee Meeting Minutes. The SLO Coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning presented these reports at Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, and Divisional Council meetings.\textsuperscript{25} Division chairs included the results of SLO assessments in annual program reviews.\textsuperscript{26}

At the writing of the 2012 \textit{Self Study in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation}, ninety-seven percent of the courses taught in the previous two years had been assessed.\textsuperscript{27} Faculty were required to file a comprehensive SLO assessment for each course taught each semester. The SLO Coordinator tracked and reported our progress\textsuperscript{28} in assessing SLOs at the course, program and institutional level. Furthermore, the required documentation now included the following:

- Report of Data (the breakdown of student scores for the assessment)
- Plan of action aimed at changes to improve student learning for the SLOs assessed
- Changes already implemented based on the previous assessment cycle
- Plans for sharing the results of the assessment\textsuperscript{29}

At that point, all courses taught at West had an ongoing SLO assessment as part of a three-semester SLO review cycle (semester 1--assess; semester 2--discuss results; semester 3--institute changes).\textsuperscript{30} This cycle fed into the annual program review process,\textsuperscript{31} where each unit reported on its progress assessing SLOs, results of assessment, as well as any changes resulting from the assessment.

\textbf{Refining the SLO Cycle: Focus on Course SLOs}

On the basis of all this work and in good faith, most members of the College community regarded institutional progress on outcomes as robust.

As the 2012 Visiting Team pointed out, however, West instructors were generally measuring Program SLOs in their courses, rather than identifying and assessing specific Course SLOs. This is not to say that instructors were not aware of the learning goals of their courses; as described above, in the process of developing Program SLOs for all degrees and state-approved certificates, they had first identified outcomes at the course level and then aggregated them into Program SLOs.\textsuperscript{32} All syllabi were required to include SLOs associated with the course and to indicate how students completing each course would demonstrate their attainment.

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

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

At the August 2012 Flex Day, 140 faculty attended breakout sessions related to student success, articulation and transfer, planning and program review, and SLOs. The SLO Coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning led a breakout session on Linking SLOs and Pedagogy: Rubrics, Assessment, and Faculty Dialogue. In this session, faculty discussed ways to engage in dialogue, and participants developed a rubric for assessing a course SLO. They presented the first edition of SLO News, the monthly SLO Newsletter that includes information on SLO progress, SLO tips, and upcoming workshops and events. The SLO Newsletter continues to be published and distributed monthly.

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

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

To facilitate this work, the Academic Senate approved an SLO addendum to the Course Outline of Record, and the Curriculum Committee doubled its normal meeting schedule. The SLO
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Addendum\(^{43}\) includes course objectives and requires Course SLOs, corresponding assessment methods, and the criterion level indicating satisfactory performance on each SLO. In addition, each course SLO is mapped to Program and Institutional SLOs.

Between August and November 2012, the SLO coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning reviewed the course outlines of record to identify the gaps in course SLOs for all currently-taught courses. The SLO Committee prepared a list of the courses\(^{44}\) that required new Course SLOs. To facilitate their identification and documentation, the SLO Committee published a handbook on Course SLO Development.\(^{45}\)

The SLO Coordinator conducted Course SLO Development Training with Division Chairs, Curriculum Committee members and Area Deans, met with representatives from all of West’s 14 instructional divisions to discuss course SLO development and review the handbook, held open SLO labs on Monday and Wednesday afternoons to train individual faculty members,\(^{46}\) and was also available by appointment. In Fall and Winter 2012, 79 such one-on-one and small group sessions had been held. On Oct. 17, 119 course outlines were updated with course SLOs; on Oct. 31, 46; on Nov. 19, 124; on Nov. 28, 87; Dec. 12, 85 and on Jan. 22, 96.

The Office of Instruction collects faculty syllabi for all courses taught each semester. In fall of 2012 the Vice President of Academic Affairs oversaw a review of each syllabus for the inclusion of SLOs. Staff trained by the SLO Coordinator assisted in the process to collect and review syllabi for SLO inclusion. The Office of Instruction contacted faculty who did not have SLOs listed. A Fall 2012 SLO Bulletin\(^ {47}\) was also developed and shared with faculty for specific information about SLOs and where to find them for inclusion on syllabi. The same process is scheduled for Spring 2013, and a Spring 2013 SLO Bulletin\(^ {48}\) was created and distributed, with updated information for faculty.

The consultant provided a *Gap Analysis* on Oct. 15, 2012, in which he detailed what the college needs to do, not only to achieve our goals for this year, but to sustain a meaningful cycle of assessment, discussion, improvement and reassessment. The SLO Committee began discussing the report at its October 25, 2012\(^ {49}\) meeting and at the November 5, 2012\(^ {50}\) meeting of the SLO Workgroup. The consultant also attended SLO Committee and Workgroup meetings to discuss the report and advise on next steps. The SLO Committee incorporated the recommendations from the Analysis into the SLO cycle at West.

The Senate also discussed these significant tasks at length at its Oct. 23 meeting.\(^ {51}\) Senators urged that the faculty continue in the ambitious task of identifying (where necessary) and assessing an SLO for each course taught in the fall 2012 semester. It was noted that SLO assessment is part of a cycle of continuous improvement, so that getting started is itself valuable, and imperative.
West is engaged in an organized, focused approach to identify Course SLOs in all current courses and to conduct authentic assessments of Course SLOs in all currently taught fall 2012 courses. As indicated in the approved timeline above, upon development of course SLOs, faculty will have discussed the results of the assessments to determine what, if any changes need to be made in the course, the SLO, or the assessment. In spring 2013, West will complete the cycle by implementing the improvements identified. Where the changes can be done by the instructors alone, they will be implemented in the spring 2013 semester; where they require changes to course outlines of record, they will be implemented in time for the following term after approval by the Curriculum Committee.

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

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

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

Faculty have met the challenge of creating high-quality SLOs and associated assessment methods with criterion levels for achievement. Currently, 95% of all courses offered in fall 2012 have developed course SLOs. The remaining courses are scheduled for review at the February
2013 Curriculum Committee meeting. Approved course SLOs have been posted on the SLO website\textsuperscript{55} for faculty to view course SLOs across the college and to access the course SLOs for inclusion on their syllabi.

**Systematic Assessment of SLOs for Improving Student Learning**

Courses are systematically evaluated for relevance, appropriateness, and achievement of student learning outcomes through the six-year Course Outline of Record update cycle. At the program level, this review is done in the environmental scan section of Program Review,\textsuperscript{56} which includes a review of the emerging trends in technology, the labor market, and community that affect the program.

The SLO Committee partnered with the West Student Poster Project Showcase that took place on May 15, 2012.\textsuperscript{57} Rubrics were applied to student capstone poster work to measure effectiveness of all nine institutional SLOs. Eleven faculty rated 83 posters with the Institutional SLO rubric. In addition, indirect assessment was conducted through questions related to institutional SLO achievement in the annual 2012 Graduate Survey. Students self-reported on how their ability in certain areas has changed based on their coursework and experiences at West.\textsuperscript{58} The SLO Committee is scheduled to review the results of the Poster Project and Graduate Survey at their February 2013 meeting.

Program SLO assessment is also documented on the Program SLO Assessment Tool.\textsuperscript{59} Assessment of programs is also reported in the Program Review process.\textsuperscript{60} In addition, course SLO are mapped to Program SLOs. Comprehensive mapping of Program SLOs to Institutional SLOs will be completed by March 2013, so comprehensive assessments can be rolled up from course-level SLO assessment data.

The college’s annual 2012 Leadership Retreat was designed to engage 120 faculty, staff, administrators and students in using data, especially SLO assessments, in planning to improve the college. Breakout sessions included reading materials related to SLO development and assessment and integration with Program Review and Planning, and then making posters that demonstrate the process.\textsuperscript{61} In addition, faculty and staff reported out the process through “tweets” and photos on Twitter. Faculty members explained their posters, such as the “nuts and bolts” of SLO development,\textsuperscript{62} Bloom’s Taxonomy,\textsuperscript{63} course objectives vs. SLOs,\textsuperscript{64} and continuous improvement.\textsuperscript{65}

To assist in SLO assessment in fall 2012, the SLO committee published a second SLO Handbook – *Back to the Basics: Course SLO Assessment*.\textsuperscript{66} In addition, workshops and one-on-one sessions were scheduled. SLO Hours were also available for faculty conducting SLO assessment. Finally, an invitation to apply to be an SLO Leader and/or Coach was sent to the faculty in December 2012.\textsuperscript{67} Three faculty members were selected, and the SLO Coordinator has trained them as
SLO Leaders, who will assist other faculty as needed with their work on the instructional SLO cycle during spring 2013. These SLO Leaders receive modest stipends for their work. Additional faculty will be recruited and trained in February 2013. At the training for the SLO Leaders, Division Chairs also participated in a review of course SLO development and assessment. Both SLO Handbooks were reviewed at the training.

Four workshops in January brought 15 faculty together to discuss the course SLOs they had measured in the fall semester, results of assessment, and changes to implement based on assessment. Some faculty worked in teams to combine assessment results from multiple sections of the same course. Others discussed assessment results and decided to adjust criterion levels. Another faculty commented on revising how assignments are weighted in her class.

Faculty reported SLO assessments on the Course SLO Assessment Tool, which was updated to include information from the course SLO Addendum such as the criterion level and course SLO mapping. In addition, it includes updated language and instructions that the SLO Committee discussed for clarity and ease-of-use. Additionally, Division Chairs scheduled Division meetings for early February to complete assessment of fall 2012 courses and engage in division-wide dialogue about assessment and improvements for teaching and learning.

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

In support of continuous, robust campus-wide dialogue, the SLO Committee is also planning an SLO Symposium at West to feature national and state SLO experts about SLO development and assessment. The tentative date for the symposium is March 2013.

**Moving from Proficiency toward Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement**

The college recognizes that its work on SLOs since the 2012 visit represents significant progress in a short amount of time, setting the stage for continuing work toward sustainable continuous quality improvement. The faculty and administration have committed to having

- Student Learning Outcomes in place for all course, programs, support services, certificates and degrees, and to their regular, authentic assessment.
- Dialogue on the results of assessment at the level of course, discipline, division, and college, leading to the identification of gaps.
- Course SLOs aligned with degree and certificate Program SLOs and Institutional SLOs.
• Comprehensive reports completed, updated and consulted on a regular basis.
• Appropriate resources allocated in each yearly planning cycle.
• Decision-making including dialogue on the results of assessment.
• Decision-making purposefully directed toward aligning college-wide practices, including the program review and planning process, to support and improve student learning
• Students aware of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled, aided by the inclusion of SLOs in syllabi and, as of March 2013, by a student-friendly SLO website developed by the SLO Committee, in conjunction with the ASO.
• The entire outcomes cycle evaluated and revised on a regular basis as outlined in the SLO Handbook that will be published by the SLO Committee in February 2013.

West is committed to keeping the forward momentum we enjoyed in the previous system while adding the depth and detail the standards and rubric require.

See also the response to Recommendation 2, for discussion of ongoing, systematic evaluation and improvement of all programs through program review; and the response to Recommendation 4 for discussion of outcomes in the services areas. 71

2 http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr0809_docs/PRSubcommittee_Minutes_6-17-09.pdf
3 http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/SLOReport3.pdf
4 http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/CourseSLOAssessmentsResults.pdf
5 http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/SLOActionReport.pdf
6 http://www.wlac.edu/accreditation/WLAC_Accred_Self_Sudy_Report_2006.pdf (we should identify the documentation behind the Self-Study assertions, and cite that where possible.
12 http://resources.wlac.edu/userfiles/apigomj/SLOPodcastMay2010.mp3
13 http://www.rpgroup.org/content/2009-power-awards
14 http://asccc.org/papers/guiding-principles-slo-assessment
16 http://www.wlac.edu/slo/committee.html
17 Senate agendas and minutes
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http://www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/index.html
http://www.wlac.edu/slo/resources/index.html
http://west-slo.weebly.com
www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/index.html
www.wlac.edu/slo
Meeting minutes
http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/SLOReport3.pdf
Senate/curriculum committee minutes
Accreditation Steering Committee minutes

Meeting minutes
Curriculum Committee meeting minutes
http://www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/documents/SLOAddendum-Blank.docx
link to the 405 courses report
Training sign-in sheets, meeting announcements and notes; SLO announcements
Senate minutes
Language Arts Division Meeting minutes and email exchange
http://www.wlac.edu/slo/course_slos.html
The retreat was also featured in the SLO News

SLO Leader and Coach announcement

SLO Committee meeting minutes
https://iportal.laccd.edu
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 IB.3, II.B.4, IV.A.2.b., IV.B.4.

Introduction

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

Establishing a System of Outcomes Assessment, 2007-2012

Student Services programs have used meaningful Service Level Outcome assessments over several cycles of Program Review. For example, in its 2007 program review, Admissions and Records had identified as a Critical Thinking and Planning outcome that students would be able to “carefully read and follow verbal and written directions,” established that the college could measure this by tracking “the percentage of complete and accurate applications and petitions,” and on the basis of the results of that measurement, decided it was necessary to “improve the clarity and visual appeal of A&R forms.”1 In its 2010 program review, Admissions, which had surveyed students on the Service Level Outcome, reported, “93% of students find our forms clear and easy to read.” In 2010, other student services programs put Service Level Outcome assessment plans in place that focused on planning and developing measurements or revising existing surveys.2

Student Services developed an SLO matrix3, which mapped Service Level Outcomes to West’s Institutional SLOs. This matrix recorded each Service Level Outcome, how it was assessed, and an included an analysis of the assessment. In Student Services’ 2010 Program Review, some programs discussed the assessment of specific Service Level Outcomes and identified changes planned as a result, while others were at the stage of ‘planning to develop’ measurements or to adjust existing assessment instruments.
Likewise, the Administrative Services Division of the College has followed the path carved by Academic Affairs and Student Services in developing and assessing outcomes. In Fall 2011, the units that comprise Administrative Services—Bookstore, Business Office, Plant Facilities, Information Technology, Personnel/Payroll, Purchasing, and Office of the Vice President for Administrative Services—created Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and subsequently assessed them through online surveys.

**Refining the Outcomes Cycle**

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

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

- **Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS):** As the result of using adaptive software in the high tech center, students will be able to access/navigate computer applications to complete assignments.
- **Admissions and Records:** As the result of Admissions and Records pushing the application exclusively online, students will access timely online support services.
- **Outreach:** As a result of participation in a field trip and subsequent individual/group advisement, students will be able to access/navigate support services.
Assessment of the Service Level Outcomes developed in each of the Student Services areas is designed to enable each area to evaluate how well it is meeting the student needs related to those Service Level Outcomes, and then to take appropriate action to improve its performance while delivering its services.

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

The Student Services Administration established a three-year cycle of assessment:

Year 1: Assess Technological Competence and Civic Responsibility Service Level Outcomes at the program level. Identify and implement needed changes.

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

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

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

Student Services recognizes the need to inaugurate the cycle in the current academic year and to use the results of assessment to make improvements either to the services, to the outcome itself, and/or to the assessment process. Admissions and Records, Athletics, DSPS, Financial Aid and International Students will be completing assessments for Technological Competence and Civic Responsibility of the five Student Services Service Level Outcomes by February 8, 2013 of the spring Semester. The DSPS department keeps data on students who use adaptive computers, and it uses the data to assess how many students are “able to access/navigate computer applications to complete assignments.” Also captured is the total or accumulated time students spend on these processes. The other seven departments will be completing assessments by March 13, 2013 they are the Associated Students Organization (ASO), Child Development Center, Counseling, Extended Opportunity Programs & Services, Matriculation Services, Outreach, and the Transfer Center).

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

SLO assessments are an important component of the annual Program Review. [Here we need some analysis of how they were dealt within the 2012 Program Review, followed by how the new system will help. I’ll need help with that analysis—perhaps the validators can be taking notes as they work.] A principal purpose of SLO assessment is to identify areas for improvement and actions that will help achieve improvement. These assessment results are registered in Program Review, where they are aligned with college and program goals. Any needed resources are requested in Program Review, from which they enter the college fiscal prioritization and decision-making process.

In the spring 2011, and continuing into fall 2012, Administrative Services participated in a series of SAO development workshops9 to address development and assessment of outcomes. These workshops allowed the unit managers to discuss past findings and to collaborate on best practices. Other notable outcomes from these working sessions were the refinement of the already existing SAOs and assessment methods and the addition of criterion levels.

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

This process has yielded a new collection of SAOs, better in that they targeted operational effectiveness in more specific terms and were also more measurable in both quantitative and qualitative terms. An SAO Assessment Supplement Tool was developed to capture the SAO, assessment method, criterion level and target dates for completion of the outcomes cycle.10 These newly created SAOs11 will be assessed in spring 2013. There are questions in the spring 2013 campus climate survey specifically created for Administrative Services that are intended to assess these SAOs as well.

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

In addition, heightened attention was given to integrating the new SAOs with the unit program reviews that took place in fall 2012. ¹² In the future, this integration should yield a clearer, stronger connection between SAOs, program review and budget in support of West’s refined approach to linking institutional planning and resource allocation.

---

¹ [http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr0910_docs/admissions-and-records.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr0910_docs/admissions-and-records.pdf)
² [http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/Part1StuServSLO1.pdf](http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/Part1StuServSLO1.pdf)
³ [http://www.wlac.edu/slo/stud_svc_slos.html](http://www.wlac.edu/slo/stud_svc_slos.html)
⁴ Quality Time needs evidence
⁵ Meeting minutes/notes
⁶ link to new Student Services SLOs
⁷ link to Student Services assessment calendar
⁸ doc-SS SLOs, DSPS SLOs
⁹ Meeting minutes/notes
¹⁰ link to SAO Supplement
¹¹ link to new SAOs
Recommendation 5 – College Catalog Currency (2012)

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

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

**Academic Freedom**

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

**Transfer Credit Policy**

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

Students should make an appointment with a counselor for transcript evaluation. ¹

Under the direction of a dean in Academic Affairs, the missing statements have been included in the 2012-2014 catalog. It has been available on the campus website since November 14, 2012.² The printed catalog arrived on campus January 24, 2013, and was widely distributed.

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

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

Draft, Feb. 1, 2013

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

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

Introduction
By systematically applying the cycle of program review, resource allocation and assessment described in the response to Recommendation 2, West Los Angeles College can identify and meet the needs of its students, including those associated with library collections and security. This cycle requires extensive exchange of information and rigorous analysis, now facilitated by online program review and thorough validation.

Library Collections
For many years, the state of California’s Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) provided most of the funds that West used to purchase books and electronic resources for its library. After a significant decline in 2002-2003, TTIP funding was generally stable until 2009-2010, when TTIP eliminated funding to individual libraries. The loss of TTIP funding left the library without a consistent source of support for the collection.

The library has consistently requested resources through West’s cycle of assessment, planning, resource allocation, and reassessment. However, in discussing the 2012 visiting team’s recommendation, administration and librarians have recognized flaws in the way West has applied that cycle to the library. Issues have been identified at several levels of the cycle: Program Review and validation; the Vice President’s prioritization of resource requests and subsequent budget allocations; and the communication of the results of the process back along the loop.

For program review, the Library and Learning Resources Division uses the template for Academic Divisions, which focuses on courses. In the 2010-2011 program review, analysis of the library was not specifically elicited, which may partially explain the lack of attention to the library collections needs. The template is flexible enough to accommodate analysis of library collections, but the librarians would have had to introduce their own data; division-specific data provided for analysis deals only with the courses taught by librarians and learning skills faculty. Probably more critically, the librarians had long been accustomed to making do with whatever funds were available; rather than systematically identifying the level of funding needed, they had focused their energies on making optimum use of the funds provided by TTIP. (1, 2)

In the 2010-2011 Library Program Review, librarians cited Title 5 CCR § 58724 benchmarks in support of a request for $150,000 to maintain and update print and electronic resources (3). Yet Title 5 benchmarks are of limited utility: if one contemplates even the most basic differences among California Community Colleges, such as their curricula and their proximity to university and other libraries faculty use in preparing courses, it becomes clear that Title 5 standards are not a one-size-fits-all measure of need. Community colleges across the state report not having funding at the Title 5 levels. At the same time, West does meet another Title 5 standard, holding 80,000 volumes to support 7,000 FTES. The 2010 program review instrument did not ask how not having the requested resource would impact the program. (4)

At the next step in Program Review the dean supervising the Library and Learning Resources Division validated its Program Review. In 2010-2011, the validation process did not systematically require feedback on the underlying data analysis, and the Library resource request went forward based primarily on the Title 5 standards. When the Vice Presidents prioritized the resource requests from all parts of the campus, they placed the library’s request at the top of the list, where it remained through to the final budget. However, given the lack of data-based argument for the $150,000 amount, in 2011 they allotted a lesser amount, which in fact was the amount that had already been billed for subscriptions to electronic resources.

The final step in the cycle should have been wide communication of the resulting decisions, including an analysis of their impact, which did not take place. Librarians did not understand which part of their resource request had been met, and their buy-in to the planning cycle suffered.

In the 2012-2013 cycle, the librarians, with feedback from division chairs, faculty and administration, have produced a data-based analysis of collection needs. They presented focused data on current needs at West (Library Instructional Resource Prioritization, 5, 6). One source was the section of the Course Outline of Record, available electronically, which lists representative reading assignments for the course. Based on the improved resource prioritization document and the Library’s Collection Development Policy, the library will be able to meet the needs of the college with a balanced approach and includes robust planning for budgetary changes.

Other sources of information employed in the 2012 program review to document the Library’s needs for quality, quantity, depth, and currency in its resources and services included

- reference desk documentation of student research needs that the collection does not meet
- records of missing titles
- a newly-reconstituted faculty and student advisory group
- faculty and student surveys

- book lists prepared by academic division chairs

The next step in Program Review is validation. This year the validators used a rubric designed to assure that sufficient data are presented in the Program Review, and that the analysis of the data is sound. When the resource requests reach the prioritization stage in February, the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which now makes the initial priority recommendations, will use program review and associated data to make an informed recommendation that accounts for the library’s identified needs. This 2012-13 process is now standard procedure, and the college has committed to meeting in sustainable fashion the needs that the library identifies and supports in the yearly program review process.

Security Measures

A striking circular staircase connects the first, second and third floors of the HLRC. Midway up the staircase that connects the main floor of the library to the main shelving floor, a mezzanine provides seating and casual reading materials, especially paperback novels. As the visiting team observed, this attractive architectural feature created a gap in library security, as a book dropped over the railing of the seating area can fall into the lobby outside the library.

In consultation with library staff, plant facilities personnel designed an upgrade to the wall separating the main floor of the library from the lobby. By moving the wall several feet into the lobby, they aligned it with the walls of the balcony above the mezzanine, eliminating the security gap. This project was finished over winter break in 2013 (7). As a result of this action, the College is confident that the collection will be secure.

References:
1. Library Circulation statistics
2. WLAC Library Collection Development Policy
3. Title 5 CCR § 58724
4. 2010-2011 Program Review
   http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/Part1AcadDivNew-16Div.pdf (p. 78 for library
5. Library Instructional Resource Prioritization
6. Justification for Budget Request, 2012-2013
7. Work Order for installation of wall in library lobby
Recommendation 7 – Financial Resources (2012)

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

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

A Record of Fiscal Responsibility
West has demonstrated its ability to assure financial stability via systematic, collegial financial planning in lean years and fat. For the 2006 and 2007 fiscal years, transparent processes involved college leadership in directing funds towards enrollment growth and implementing the college Educational Master Plan. FTES for 2006-2007 increased by 13.3 over the previous year; for 2007-2008, by 8.9 percent; and for 2008-9, by 13 percent.\(^1\) When budgets were reduced for the fiscal years from 2008 to 2013 the college used its governance and planning processes to make similarly thoughtful, data-based, widely-understood and judicious cuts, often on very short notice.\(^2\) The Enrollment Management Plan guided the Enrollment Management Committee in reducing class offerings while achieving some enrollment growth through increased class sizes. \(^3\) The single budget deficit was in fiscal year 2009, when the cuts occurred in the middle of the year already underway.\(^4\)

West is able to balance its budget, with the exception noted, through the use of regular monitoring and adjustments to expenditures to adjust to shifting fiscal conditions throughout each fiscal year. The major tools used include:
- Quarterly budget reports
- Monthly budget updates that include coordination between Administrative Services and Academic Affairs regarding the cost of instruction
- Quarterly budget meetings between college staff (president, vice presidents, budget manager, researcher, other deans) and district staff (Chief Financial Officer, Director of Budget and Management Analysis, head of attendance accounting unit) to review and discuss FTES and budget issues. District staff present issues of concern for discussion.
- Monthly budget/expenditure updates presented by the Vice President of
**Recommendation 7 – Financial Resources (2012)**

**Administrative Services to the Budget Committee**

The Budget Committee is a participatory governance committee which reports to the College Council. The monthly budgets and expenditure reports provide an opportunity for college-wide dialogue to occur about budgetary issues that arise, and to provide direction when choices must be made.

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

**Honing Evaluation**

As noted in the response to Recommendation 2, the PIE Committee and the Budget Committee have scheduled a joint meeting to evaluate the effectiveness of 2011-2012 expenditures (and those of the 2012-2013 fiscal year for which data would be available) for February 21, 2013. In preparation, the PIE Committee reviewed reports generated by the Institutional Effectiveness System (described in the response to Recommendation 2) on the impact of receiving or not receiving requested resources; on the impact of a hypothetical 5% budget cut; on assessment of progress on prior goals; and on new unit goals.  

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

As noted under Recommendation 2, the college has refined its program review and planning processes and is using them for 2013-2014 fiscal year planning as well as to assess the results of the 2011-2012 fiscal plan. In keeping with the principle of continuous improvement, the college has recognized the usefulness of more data and better information on the effects of both increased and reduced expenditures. For the fall 2012 program review process, the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIE) Committee revised the program review instrument to that end. New topics addressed included:

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

West piloted a new web-based program review instrument, IES (Institutional Effectiveness System), in fall 2012. Of particular importance in integrating planning and resource
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allocation is the feature which guides authors in linking proposed actions to college and program goals and to resource requests. New data supported informed responses to the questions addressing the new topics. For the first time, a report of expenditures and budget over a period of three years was provided.\textsuperscript{9} Submission deadlines were extended to allow more time for thoughtful, comprehensive analysis as program review managers and team members realized that they wanted to provide more detailed and complete responses.

The PIE Committee began a discussion of the responses to these questions at its meeting on January 23, 2013, basing the dialogue on reports generated from the program review data, and posted online.\textsuperscript{10} Divisions and departments offered thoughtful comments in response to the question, “What would your Division/ Department cut if there were a required 5% budget reduction? How do you use college vision, mission and goals, and Division/ Department goals to inform the decision?” as illustrated by the Child Development/Family & Consumer Studies response:

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

Responding to a question about the impact of not receiving requested resources, Information Technology, based on Help Desk, Network usage, and system downtime records reported the impact of insufficient funding:

“System Crash often, More stress, difficulty for technical problem solving, troubleshoot procedure and slow network traffic. Not up-to-date Technology. Difficulty for technology problem solving, troubleshoot and very slow support.”

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

The validation stage of the program review process was also strengthened. In previous cycles, a dean and/or vice president would read the program reviews from those he or she supervised, and decide whether they were adequate. This year, deans and vice presidents worked in teams on the validation, using a newly-developed set of focused validation questions which guided the
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validators in considering the accuracy of information and the depth of analysis as well as to elicit validator comments. Of 50 completed program reviews, 15 were returned for further information or analysis, frequently refinement of concepts crucial to the integration of planning for the effective use of financial resources. For example, the matriculation program authors were asked to clarify the relationship between service level outcomes and staffing and to make resource requests for staffing more explicit; language arts needed to link goals, actions and resource requests, and plant facilities was asked to clarify the relationship between its resource requests and its service outcomes. The Extended Opportunity Programs & Services program review was returned for more detail and evidence about the assertions made in their program review, as summarized in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Validation Status</th>
<th>Reason for Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the trends in FTEF. What are the implications for your program?</td>
<td>The program recognizes its significant role to the college on the number of FTEF it contributes to the college.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Please include a statement of staffing needs based on the number of student currently served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has the Office / Program / Service done regarding implementation of accreditation recommendations?</td>
<td>We are in the process of resuming advisory board meetings,</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Please list the date of the next advisory board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would your Division/Department cut if there were a required 5% budget reduction? How do you use college vision, mission and goals, and Division/Department goals to inform the decision?</td>
<td>Using the college mission, vision, and goals - a 5% reduction would impact the discretionary items that do not impact student success. For example, supplies, new technology, and extended hours of operation.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Please give examples of discretionary items (i.e., supplies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the Office / Program / Service addressed the recommendations from the previous program review? Address each recommendation separately.</td>
<td>The only recommendation from the last program review was to extend the advisory committee. The advisory committee will be adding members from the feeder high schools and the community.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>When will this be done and please provide list of advisory committee members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This enhanced validation process proved challenging, such that deadlines for completion had to be extended. While validation was still in progress, the Office of Planning and Research used the IES to generate preliminary reports drawing from unvalidated program reviews. A collation of reported facilities needs supported preparation of the space needs assessment under the direction of the Facilities Committee. Responses to questions about resource needs and college and unit goals helped the PIE Committee to plan for the process of prioritizing resource requests and to begin to evaluate the usefulness of the questions themselves.

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. College Council minutes on adopting Principles for Budget Prioritization.
4. Budget balances for 2006-2012 – Needs a citation
5. Administrative Services will upload these documents so we can link to them.
6. PIEC minutes Jan. 23 and the reports used at the meeting
7. PIEC minutes Jan. 23
10. PIEC Committee Minutes: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee.html Program Review Reports: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr1213-Reports.html
14. need a report from ORP
15. Program review reports: http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/pr1213-Reports.html
18. PIEC minutes Jan. 23: http://www.wfac.edu/orp/planning/planning_committee.html
19. PIEC charge
Recommendation 13 of 2006

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

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

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

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

The 2006 Self Study identified problems in committee communication, and West recognized that it is a committee’s effectiveness of that makes participation meaningful and sustainable. The College Council and the Academic Senate refined procedures to make committee participation more productive. More and more agendas and minutes are being posted on the college website. In September 2012 divisions began to use agenda templates which included curriculum and SLO dialogue. The Student Success Committee, housing Achieving the Dream, experimented with new models of interpersonal communications, such as having each member agree to speak to five colleagues on an issue the committee identified. West’s first Semester Kickoff in fall 2012 demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach. Eight students, 47 faculty, 10 administrators and 29 staff participated in this activity, a day before classes started in which students could come and meet faculty and get acquainted with college services. Facilities staff served as greeters. A Kickoff for the spring semester took place on Feb. 1, with similar participation.