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

After a few false starts, West Los Angeles College adopted its first complete Integrated Master Plan (IMP) in 2003, [http://wlac.edu/masterplan/documents/WLAC-EMP2002-2008.pdf http://wlac.edu/masterplan/documents/WLAC-FacilitiesMasterPlan2003.pdf http://wlac.edu/masterplan/documents/WLAC-ITPlan2003.pdf] and has since achieved steady improvements 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 to guide projects funded by three large bond measures. One theme often addressed in this process has been the need to measure progress towards achieving West’s goals.

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 could focus. As the Committee set out to produce a 2011-2014 EMP, it welcomed the assistance of the Dean of Planning and Research, who devised the implementation matrix that the Committee used to assess progress towards achieving the goals of the 2008 plan. This assessment contributed to the Committee’s recommendation to restate most of the goals and objectives in the 2011 plan, adding implementation specifics, facilitators and measures of achievement.

Both iterations of the EMP followed the same path to adoption: the EPSC recommended each plan to the Curriculum Committee, which reviewed it before recommending it to the Academic Senate. The College President accepted the Academic Senate’s recommendation to adopt each plan. The ESPC is refining the matrix to specify the levels of achievement required to meet each goal more precisely. Thus, the college will continue to be able to gage improvements in institutional effectiveness in respect to these goals.

The Student Services Council devised the 2008-20 Student Services Strategic Plan in support of the EMP. This administrative body adjusted the plan (now the 2011-2017 Student Services Plan) in deliberations from xx to xx. The 2008 plan generally listed discrete tasks as strategies, implying that they are either done or not done; in its second iteration, the Council assigned measures of achievement to these tasks so that the college can better gage its progress. [Need documentation about the adoption of the SSP]
As the visiting team of March 2012 pointed out, the 2009-2016 Technology Master Plan (TMP) does not state its goals in measurable terms. Having set up several workgroups to establish implementation matrices for each TMP goal in February 2012, in September the Technology Committee added to these workgroups’ charges to define measurable outcomes. At that time the Dean of Research and Planning clarified for the Committee how to define measures so that the goals of the plan can be assessed and evaluated. These measures slot into the work already done on to assess progress on implementation matrices. Each goal has at least one strategy whose progress can be measured. [Documentation needed--actions taken by the committee and the College Council in November]

The greatest challenge in this area has been the Facilities Plan. The passage of three district bond measures made the college facilities planning more complex with the adoption of two separate environmental impact reports for construction. Thus, the Facilities section of the 2003 Integrated Master Plan (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 new projects, the Board of Trustees certified a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and a Facilities Master Plan update in August 2010. Each of these Environmental Impact Reports had a legal role in guiding the bond projects. The completion of the projects specified in the EIRs became the focus of facilities planning. A Building Program Management Committee (BPMC) tracked progress on the bond-funded projects, in effect treating their completion as the measures of the plan’s goals. The Facilities Committee fell into disuse, with the Work Environment Committee devising approaches to any pressing issues beyond the scope of the bond projects. In 2011 the College Council revived the Facilities Committee, replacing the BPMC.

In July 2012, the Facilities Committee 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. Work continues, including using the data produced in the Program Review process to both measure progress on facilities. The Facilities Committee is also working to consolidate, update, and specify the goals in the various facilities planning documents.

West is working to specify the goals in its master plans and annual plans in measurable terms so that the college can better assess their achievement and discuss them in the 2012-2013 cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation to gage improvement in institutional effectiveness. The college is preparing to use its established deliberative processes to create a new IMP centering on educational plans, and identifying mechanisms to measure progress towards all identified college goals.
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**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.A.4, I.B)*

West Los Angeles College has been incrementally improving its planning processes for many years, and in the fall of 2012 is in the position to assess its cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation to gage improvement in institutional effectiveness. West has systematically updated its plans, to the point that a new Integrated Master Plan is being contemplated to integrate systematically-collected data, such as Program Reviews and environmental scans.

In the first decade of the 21st century, West Los Angeles College recognized the need for systematic planning; learned how to make plans and systematically use them to guide decision-making; and began to do so. By 2012, West was using a set of interlocking master plans and, at the same time, systematically revising them.

The first of these plans to have been written and adopted was the Integrated Master Plan (2002-2003). Consultants hired to guide West primarily in assessing its long-term facilities needs facilitated extensive planning discussions and drafted the more-than-500-page document which the appropriate shared-governance constituencies recommended for approval. In spring 2007, West adopted an Educational Master Plan (EMP), the first step in updating and strengthening the Integrated Master Plan by refining its component plans to better address the college’s needs. A Student Services Strategic Plan (SSSP) followed in fall 2007, and a Technology Master Plan in 2009. The EMP and SSSP were each updated in 2011. College Committees wrote each of these plans. Each of the plans focuses on strategic three-to-seven-year goals, replacing the laudable, but less-focused plans of the IMP. The EMP and SSSP included implementation matrices to document progress.

West’s Program Review process predates all these plans. Since first implementing this college-wide process in 1998(?) as Program Review/Unit Planning, the college has made incremental, iterative improvements, so that in 2011 Program Review anchored a full cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation. In fall of 2012 Program Review moved online, using a new software system, IES. The program review section calls for the evaluation of progress and identification of needs; the planning section includes goal-setting, action plans, and any necessary resource requests. The Dean of Research and Planning conducted five workshops in fall 2012 and produced a Program Review Handbook so that all chairs, managers and deans understand the new system, and emphasize S.M.A.R.T. goals. The revised instrument calls for measurable goals in all plans.

--------

This draft draws primarily on information from the Corrective Action Matrix and has not been widely discussed.
For Program Review, Research and Planning provides data such as

- Student tracking trends
- Course enrollment trends
- Section count trends
- Student demographic trends
- Student success trends
- Labor market information
- Environmental scan information

For the first time, a validation rubric will be used in assessing the quality of each Program Review, and cross-divisional validation is being piloted in six divisions and programs. Also new to this cycle are questions that require chairs and other managers to consider how a decrease in funding would affect their work.

[Do we need to review the history of our Program Review Process in this report?]

--------
This draft draws primarily on information from the Corrective Action Matrix and has not been widely discussed.
Recommendation 2 – Systematic Evaluation and Planning (2012): 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).

West has been doing program review since 1999, steadily improving its process over time. The process is now fully online, with significant data prepopulated for the authors—division chairs, deans and program managers. As the college has developed and updated its overarching plans, the program review instrument has instructed authors to link their goals to those of the plans. Since 2008, this linkage has stressed the Educational Master Plan. Program Review feeds directly into resource allocation through a process that is grounded in West’s well-established structures of participatory governance. [Documentation: PR instruments since 2008]

Improvements for the 2012-2013 cycle focus on 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. [Documentation: CC minutes on PIEC incorporating PR]

In 2010-11, program goals were already explicitly linked to institutional goals and program assessment results, and action plans were linked explicitly to program goals. Programs indicated for each action whether it would require additional resources, and the resource request was supposed to follow from that indication, though the resource request itself did not point back to the action. Finally, programs were asked to list other programs on which each resource request has an impact. Overall, the quality of the submitted documents was uneven, as the 2012 evaluation team noted.

Some participants lacked a thorough understanding of the process and its purposes, or perceived program review more as a mechanism for justifying resource requests than as a process to facilitate program and institutional improvements, some of which might require additional resources. Thus, some program goals in the 2010-11 Program Review, despite instructions in the Guides to the contrary, were merely resource requests. A few examples: “Hire 4 new Custodians”; “Electronic Resources – Two (2) Desktops”; “Create classified positions which support Distance Learning” “Hire a Full Time Dance Instructor” (even though the handbook pointed out explicitly that obtaining a new faculty member was not a goal, but rather a resource request in support of an action plan that was aligned with a program goal). The title of Part 2 in 2010-11: “Linking Planning to Budget” may have contributed to this misunderstanding.

In fall of 2012, the College Council combined the Program Review Committee with the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC) to more logically organize the program review process within the planning cycle. At the same time, the college engaged a consultant who
assisted the PIEC in reviewing planning and program review procedures for cohesion, incorporation of existing policies, and meaningful evaluation.

The Planning Committee and the Program Review Committee (later reconfigured as PIEC) had began its periodic revision of the program review instrument in the spring of 2012. Additions to the 2012-13 Program Review instrument include:

i. Assessment of progress on division/department goals

ii. Evaluation of the effects of resources requested/received over the past two years

iii. Response to recommendations from the prior program review (a requirement that had applied only to non-instructional programs in 2010-11)

iv. Table of course outcomes, assessment methods, summaries of results, planned actions, and whether or not the planned actions will require additional resources

v. A similar table of program outcomes

vi. Separate assessment plans for course and program outcomes

vii. Documentation of faculty dialogue regarding SLO assessment results and improvement plans

viii. 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

ix. A new module on the likely implications of budgetary reductions and of program termination

x. Assessment of the impact of improvements in CTE programs

xi. Measurable results at the planning goal level

Extensive training on the new software used in program review and on the revised instrument took place in the fall of 2012 and incorporated a new Program Review Handbook. The series of program review workshops conducted emphasized several points:

- The purpose of program review is to assess and evaluate the progress of the department in addressing its goal and set new goals. Resource requests may flow from this assessment.
- The completed program review must show how its goals align with college goals.
- Goals must be distinguished from action plans.

Another improvement in the 2012-2013 program review process came in the validation stage. Each program review is now to be validated by a team, using a rubric designed to assure
completeness and cohesiveness. In a pilot cross-divisional validation, the teams will be drawn from more than one of the main divisions of the college (Academic Affairs, Student Services and Administrative Services).

The PIEC also laid plans for committees to evaluate progress towards the goals of the Educational Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, Student Services Plan, and Facilities Master Plan, using the results of Program Review. In addition, program reviews are being used in a comprehensive facilities needs assessment.
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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.)

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 early 2012, West believed it had demonstrated proficiency in the SLO cycle; the college has since recognized the need for a major adjustment, committed to it, and plunged into the work required to implement it.

Establishing a Cycle of SLO Assessment, 2002-2012

At the root of West’s SLO cycle was a college-wide agreement on Institutional SLOs initially identified by the faculty and subsequently adopted by non-instructional programs as well. Progress was incremental, as early adopters modeled SLO assessment, AFT Faculty Guild and the Board of Trustees clarified full- and part-time faculty obligations in the contract, and the Planning and Program Review committee modified instruments to fold SLO assessment into planning. 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 and administrative support to shepherd the institutionalization of the SLO assessment cycle. At the 2009 Student Success Conference, the RP Group honored West’s SLO Coordinator for his SLO work. [http://www.rpgroup.org/content/2009-power-awards]. 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. [http://asccc.org/papers/guiding-principles-slo-assessment].

West began working on defining and assessing Student Learning Outcomes in November 2002, when faculty and administrators attended a Student Learning Outcomes Workshop led by the Research and Planning Group (RP Group). The college formed an SLO Committee in spring 2003, which led a group of faculty in identifying Institutional SLOs by November 2004. Groups of faculty from disparate disciplines met together and pondered 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. 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. In order to
apply a Program SLO to a course, an instructor needed to reverse this process, matching an assessment in the course to a Program SLO.

By 2006, the college began an SLO Portfolio Project to capture SLO assessment, with about 25% of the faculty starting the project each year through 2009. Focusing on high-impact 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, independent of 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. In this way, West calibrated grade on individual assessments (essays, quizzes, speeches, art projects, etc.) with SLO achievement, 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—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.  

West described its SLO assessment procedure its 2009 *Focused Midterm Report*:

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

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

In accepting the Midterm Report, the Commission made no comment on SLOs, asking for resolution only of a recommendation on unfunded retiree health benefits.

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 dialog on assessment results, leading to improved teaching and learning.

http://resources.wlac.edu/userfiles/apigomj/SLOPodcastMay2010.mp3
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The 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 Co-Chairs West’s SLO Committee. He expanded the scope of SLO development, review and revision beyond the previous focus on academic SLOS to include all divisions and programs in the college. To support this wider sweep, the college created an SLO taskforce (which evolved into an SLO Committee reporting to the Academic Senate through the Curriculum Committee) with representatives from the three major divisions of the college (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services). Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee members serve as resources to the taskforce. The SLO Coordinator works with the Curriculum Committee on technical review of courses, and reporting at all Academic Senate meetings on SLO progress.

In August 2011, the college hired a Dean of Teaching and Learning. She provides leadership over SLOs, supervises the SLO Coordinator, and co-chairs the SLO Committee.

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 their courses and programs, and which also clearly aligned courses with both Institutional and Program SLOs. [documentation http://www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/index.html] The new SLO Coordinator held one-on-one training sessions and workshops with faculty, and the SLO Committee mounted an extensive video tutorial on the college website. [http://west-slo.weebly.com] The website also features the SLO Coordinator’s focused and comprehensive reports on all course SLO work completed to date, including graphics conveying the work for the path to proficiency. [Documentation—process diagrams – www.wlac.edu/slo; reports – www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/index.html.] The SLO Committee also developed and distributed a Year-in-Review 2011-2012 report that included SLO History and Assessment Plans, SLO Reports, SLO Process Diagrams, SLO Assessment, SLO Committee Meeting Minutes. [documentation – http://www.wlac.edu/slo/forms/documents/SLOYearinReview2011-12.pdf] The SLO Coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning presented these reports Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, and Divisional Council meetings. Division chairs included the results of SLO assessments in annual program reviews.

At the writing of the 2012 Self Study in support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation, all syllabi were required to include SLOs and an indication of how students completing the course would demonstrate their attainment. 97 percent of the courses taught in the previous two years had been assessed. Faculty were required to file a comprehensive SLO assessment for each course taught each semester. The SLO Coordinator was tracking and reporting our progress in assessing SLOs at the course, program and institutional level. Furthermore, the required documentation now included

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

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, 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 goals of their courses; in the course of developing Program SLOs for all degrees and state-approved certificates, they had first identified SLOs at the course level and then aggregated them into Program SLOs. Some disciplines, notably mathematics, had seen the necessity of assigning Program SLOs to individual courses, or of breaking down Program SLOs and assigning portions of them to specific courses. In other words, they were identifying Course SLOs. All syllabi were required to include SLOs associated with the course and to indicate how students completing the 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 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, Matthew Lee, 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. In effect, 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 of 2012 the Accreditation Steering committee asked various established committees to form workgroups to address the recommendations and an SLO Workgroup, comprised from 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, the SLO Coordinator and Dean of Teaching and Learning led a breakout session on Linking SLOs and Pedagogy: Rubrics, Assessment, and Faculty Dialogue. They presented the first edition of the monthly SLO Newsletter that includes updates on SLO progress, SLO tips, and upcoming events. In this session, faculty discussed ways to engage in dialogue, and participants developed a rubric. [documentation - http://www.wlac.edu/slo/documents/slo_news/SLONews-Aug2012.pdf, http://www.wlac.edu/slo/documents/slo_news/SLONews-Sept2012.pdf, http://www.wlac.edu/slo/documents/slo_news/SLONews-Oct2012.pdf]

The timeline agreed to by the Academic Senate, College Council, and appropriate committees (PIE, Curriculum and SLO Committees) in September is ambitious:
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- By the end the fall 2012 semester, course outlines of all courses taught in fall 2012 will include at least one course SLO.
- Before the spring 2013 semester faculty will discuss SLO assessment results, using them to evaluate all courses for:
  - Course SLOs
  - Achievement of SLOs
  - Currency
- The fall 2012 Program Review incorporates SLO assessment to link assessment with planning and resource requests.
- In spring 2013, faculty will 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 Addendum includes course objectives and requires Course SLOs, corresponding assessment methods, and the criterion levels representing 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 that required new Course SLOs. To facilitate their identification and documentation, the SLO Committee published a handbook on Course SLO Development [link to document]. The SLO Coordinator conducted Course SLO Development Training with Division Chairs, Curriculum Committee members and Area Deans, and met with representatives from all of West’s 14 divisions to discuss course SLO development and review the handbook, and held open SLO labs on Monday and Wednesday afternoons to train individual faculty members. By Oct. 23, 13 such one-on-one sessions had been held. On Oct. 17, 119 course outlines were updated with course SLOs; on Oct. 31, 46; on Nov. 19, xx; and on Nov. 28, xx.

The Office of Instruction is collecting faculty syllabi for all courses taught in fall 2012. The SLO Coordinator trained staff on reviewing syllabi for inclusion of SLOs. Faculty who do not have SLOs listed are contacted, and an SLO Bulletin with SLO information [documentation-need to link to this] is also sent.

[Here we need to describe our plans for discussing SLO assessment data and making any changes needed.] 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, those changes will be implemented in time for the following term.
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 Senate discussed these significant tasks at length at its Oct. 23 meeting. Although the college president suggested a more gradual pace for identifying course SLOs, no Senators supported this route, and many 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. [Here any subsequent Senate actions, plus any of College Council and Divisional Council, if they come.]

West is engaged in a full-court press to identify Course SLOs in all current courses and to conduct authentic assessments of Course SLOs in all fall courses. Before the start of the next semester (February, 2013) 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. Some will require changes to the Course Outline of Record, which the Curriculum Committee will oversee in the first half of 2013; others will involve changes in pedagogy and will be applied to courses in the Spring 2013 semester. The SLO Committee is also planning an SLO Symposium at West to feature national and state SLO experts. The tentative date for the symposium is March 2013.

Despite the pressing 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 utilizing the additional one-on-one sessions with the SLO Coordinator to get clarification on the process and hone their skills even further.

After faculty developed the course SLO (using the course objectives to develop the outcome), they reviewed the SLO with their Division Chair who then sent it to the SLO Coordinator to review and confirm that there is a robust course SLO in place that is based on the course objectives, an assessment method(s) to assess the outcome, and a criterion level attached to the outcome 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.

One example of how this communication cycle has taken place was the evolution of English courses in mid-November 2012. The division originally decided that real world outcomes for some courses would be to have students develop progressively better essays for courses in a sequence. After review with the SLO Coordinator, the decision evolved to using essays as the assessment for these courses and the outcomes became “defend an argument with a thesis...” Faculty discussed this in division meetings and continued the conversation on email. The process was very engaging and allowed for input and collaboration by faculty.
The college’s annual Leadership Retreat was designed to engage 120 faculty, staff, administrators and students in using data, especially SLO assessments, in planning to improve the college.

To assist in SLO assessment in fall 2012, the SLO committee is publishing a second SLO Handbook – *Back to the Basics: SLO Assessment* [documentation – need to link to this]. In addition, workshops and one-on-one sessions will be scheduled. SLO Hours will also be available for faculty conducting SLO assessment.

Faculty have met the challenge of creating high-quality SLOs and associated assessment methods. Almost all SLO Addenda presented to the Curriculum Committee and subsequently incorporated in to the Course Outlines of Record have identified more than the target of one Course SLO.

Workshops in January brought faculty together to discuss the Course SLOs they had measured in the fall semester. XX new lesson plans resulted, as well as XX syllabus revisions, and plans for XX revisions to course outlines, including course SLOS.

[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 on sustainable continuous quality improvement. The faculty in particular have committed to having

- Student Learning Outcomes in place for all course, programs, certificates and degrees, and to their regular, authentic assessment.
- Dialog 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.
- Student awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

Administration support, as well as faculty commitment, will assure that

- Decision-making includes dialog on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning college-wide practices to support and improve student learning.
- Appropriate resources continue to be allocated.
- Comprehensive reports are completed, updated and consulted on a regular basis.
- The entire outcomes cycle is evaluated and revised on a regular basis.
West is committed to keeping the forward momentum we enjoyed in the previous system while adding the depth and detail the standards require.
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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, IIB.4, IV.A.2.b., IV.B.4).

Student Services has reviewed West’s institutional SLOs and matched them with Student Services areas. They have decided on five Student Services Division SLOs that are applicable to the Student Services areas and can be measured. They will then take these to the department level. The SLOs will read, “As a result of <service>, <SLO information>.” They are also identifying measurements for each SLO. Two SLOs will be assessed each year, so all SLOs are assessed in a three-year cycle. The SLOs will be assessed at both the Student Services Divisional and Department levels.

There will be a regular review of the entire cycle of assessment, evaluation and decision-making.

This only gives an idea of how we expect to address this recommendation in the Follow-Up Report. It draws on material from the Corrective Action Matrix, but has not been discussed.
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.)

Under the direction of a dean in Academic Affairs, the missing statements have been included in the new catalog, which has been available on line since xx 2012. The printed catalog will arrive on campus by March 2013.

XX is developing procedures for updating the catalog online between editions.
Recommendation 6 – Library Collection Development and Security (2012): 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)

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.

In Program Review, the Library and Learning Resources Division uses the template for Academic Divisions, which focuses on courses. 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. [Evidence: Documentation of how librarians figured out where to spend collection funds. 2006 Self Study mentions using circulation data to identify areas that are big users.

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. 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. When TTIP funding was at its height, West spent nowhere near this amount annually. At the same time, West does meet another Title 5 standard, holding 80,000 volumes to support 7,000 FTES. The Program Review instrument did not ask how not having the requested resource would impact the program. [evidence: 2010-2011 PR at http://www.wlac.edu/orp/planning/program_review/Part1AcadDivNew-16Div.pdf Need support for the assertion that T5 levels are not usually met.]

At the next step in Program Review the dean supervising the Library and Learning Resources Division validated its Program Review. In 2010-2011, she did not request evidence to support the $150,000 resource request, and the process continued without the librarians being asked to provide further data or analysis to support it. 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. 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 have stepped up to produce a data-based analysis of collection needs. In their 2012-2013 Program Review, they present focused data on current needs at West. One source is the section of the Course Outline of Record, available electronically, which lists representative reading assignments for the course. Sampling this data, the library estimates that $50,000 would purchase the books needed to fill this gap.

Other sources of information on library needs include
- 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 will use 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, there should be enough associated data for the Vice Presidents to make an informed recommendation that accounts for the library’s identified needs. The college has committed to meeting identified needs for the library.

Security Measures
A circular staircase connects the first, second and third floors of the HLRC. Midway up the striking circular 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. This attractive architectural feature creates 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 x feet into the lobby, they aligned it with the walls of the balcony above the mezzanine, eliminating the security gap, while providing space for xxx. This project will be completed over winter break in 2013. As a result of this action, the College is confident that the collection will be secure.
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.)*

West has demonstrated its ability to assure financial stability via systematic, collegial financial planning in lean years and fat: for the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 fiscal years, transparent processes involved college leadership in directing funds towards enrollment growth and implementing the college Educational Master Plan; the fiscal years from 2008 to 2012 saw similarly thoughtful, widely-understood processes used to make judicious cuts, often on very short notice. The growth initiatives resulted in a net xx% growth in FTES over from 2006 to 2009; the cuts contributed to modest surpluses in three out of four very difficult years. The single budget deficit was in 2008-2009, when the cuts occurred in the middle of the year already underway.

For 2012-2013 fiscal year planning, the college has refined its planning processes. The college recognizes the usefulness of more and better data on the effects of expenditures and budget reductions. For the fall, 2012 program review process, the PIEC revised the instrument to that end. New topics to be 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, in fall 2012. [carry-over of data and plans, other advantages]. As those responsible for completing program review rose to the challenge of providing better data and analyzing them carefully, November program review workshops drew leaders from all across the campus. Their eagerness to do a quality job resulted in one 3-hour workshop running for 5 hours. The dean of research and planning addressed an email to the group, “Dear Program Review fanatics.” Deadlines were extended from early to late November to allow more time for thoughtful analysis.

The validation stage of the program review process was also strengthened. In previous cycles, a dean would read the program reviews from those he or she supervised, and decide whether they were adequate. This year, deans will work in pairs on the validation, using a rubric designed to see to it that each program review is complete. Incomplete ones will be returned for further work.
In devising a rubric to use in prioritizing resource requests, the Planning and Intuitional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC) reviewed the 2011 Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services and requested that the College Council update them. Based on the new priorities, the PIEC developed a prioritization rubric at its December XX meeting so that it could be fully discussed before being applied to the planning for the 2013-2014 fiscal year. At the same time, the PIEC scheduled formal reviews of the previous years’ planning process for early winter and the current Program Review process (including its integration with planning and other processes) for the late spring.

The college is committed to continue using its cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation including:

- Aligning plans
- Strengthening information collection and dissemination, such as Program Review
- assessing our levels of achievement
- discussing our plans and our progress
- using results to make decisions leading to institutional improvement.
- documenting progress on implementation matrices.
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2006 Recommendation 13 “All college personnel should identify ways to increase participation in governance and develop trust throughout the institution by conducting meaningful, timely dialogue that acknowledges different perspectives and ideas for making informed decisions.” Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a

Administration, faculty, staff and student leadership at West is firmly committed to seeking the fullest possible participation in robust dialog and meaningful decision-making. While it is probably not feasible to get every employee to focus on increasing participation, the college governance structure does offer 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. They 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. 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. 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. XX students, XX faculty, and XX 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.

An earlier draft was discussed at the College Council.