

Accreditation Steering Committee Homework

1/6/2014

Rebecca Tillberg

Recommendation 1 (and 5 of 2006) Measurable Goal Setting	
<p>1. What specifically troubled the Commission?</p> <p>(Evaluation Report: West Los Angeles College, March 2012)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● the cycle of integrated program review, planning, and budgeting has not been fully implemented in terms of evaluating the impact on institutional effectiveness (p18)● Regarding the EMP, No definitions could be found of what constitutes progress or achievement of goals, making it difficult to ascertain how the college determines improvements in institutional effectiveness (p19)● Goals described in the Facilities Plan and Technology Plan are not stated in measurable terms and, hence, it is unclear whether progress toward achieving those goals has been assessed in a way that accommodates improvement of institutional effectiveness (p19)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ the specific operational links that assure centrality of the mission in master planning for technology and facilities are not clear○ the adopted principles used to prioritize annual plans with resource allocation requests includes as its second principle “focus on core mission.” No such direct connection to the mission was evident in the college’s master plans for technology and facilities (p 20)● Regarding program review/validation: it is not clear whether validation is conducted by employing consistent practices for determining the adequacy of document contents (p 20)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This inconsistent quality in program review information may, in turn, compromise the capacity of the college’s review and planning system to enable sound decisions that lead to improvement of institutional effectiveness (p 20)➡ Regarding program review and unit goal setting: no measures are requested for defining progress and performance on the goal, making evaluation and decisions for improvement difficult. (p 21)➡ it is not clear how progress on all of the college’s goals as stated on its master plans for facilities and technology can inform decisions about improvement of institutional effectiveness if they cannot all be assessed (p 21)➡ Unfortunately, given the college’s current planning process involves budget augmentations

	<p>only, it is not clear whether broad-based input is enabled in the establishment of the base annual allocation—indeed, the process for establishing base allocations is not clear (p 22)</p> <p>➡ This, coupled with the fact that it cannot be determined whether the college’s planning process adequately leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness, indicates that the college falls short of meeting this standard</p>
<p>2. What are we supposed to be doing now? (That is, what does the Commission say we are, or should be, doing to respond to the recommendations? What did we say we were doing or planning to do?)</p> <p>(WLAC Follow-up Report)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In January 2013, WLAC embarked on a comprehensive revision of the college’s plans, intended to center college planning on educational excellence, to continue WLAC’s tradition of open and transparent processes, to more clearly identify and link program and student success data to planning and resource allocation cycles, and to result in measurable improvement to the college (p 8) • Student Services is scheduled to complete their next annual evaluation of the Plan by the end of Spring 2013 (p 11) • At its February 19, 2013 meeting, the Technology Committee reviewed the measures and determined that they should be tracked as the committee works on a new TMP, aiming to present it to College Council in fall 2013. (p 11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With assistance from a consultant, the committee also recognized the need to fully update the TMP with concrete milestones, timelines and responsible persons, and committed to adding them to the plan. (p 11) • In July of 2012 it formed a workgroup to establish measurable outcomes for the broader goals in the Facilities Plan. The group developed a matrix including measures of achievement and progress towards each goal, as well as relationships with Educational Master Plan goals and objectives. Work continues, including using the data produced in the Program Review process to measure progress on facilities. The Facilities Committee is also working to consolidate, update, and specify the goals in the various facilities planning documents (p 14) • 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 (p 14) • The college recognizes the need to use its established deliberative processes to create a new EMP that can guide other college plans, and to identify mechanisms to measure progress

	towards all identified college goals. (p 14)
3. Which committees should be involved in what we should be doing now? (Note what they should be doing.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIE Committee and Academic Senate – Update the Educational Master Plan so that it has measureable goals with readily-available data, followed by regular review and evaluation of progress on institutional goals. • Student Services Council – Contribute to the identification of measureable goals for the updated Educational Master Plan. • Facilities Committee – Update the Facilities Plan so that is has goals that are measurable with explicit quantitative measures. • Technology Committee – Update the Technology Plan so that it has specific quantitatively measureable goals; review and evaluate progress on reaching the goals.
4. Which college employees have responsibility for what we should be doing now?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice Presidents • Deans • Faculty Leaders • Committee Chairs
5. What evidence did we use in our presentations to the Commission or visiting team?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee minutes • planning documents • policy and procedures manuals • process diagrams • data • program review reports • survey results
6. What evidence might we use in the Midterm report? (Include evidence we should be collecting, as well as what is already available.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee minutes • planning documents • policy and procedures manuals • process diagrams • data • program review reports • EMP Newsletter • workshop evaluations • survey results

Recommendation 2 Systematic Evaluation and Planning	
1. What specifically troubled the Commission?	See above.
2. What are we supposed to be doing now? (That is, what does the Commission say we are, or should be, doing to respond to the recommendations? What did we say we were doing or planning to do?) (WLAC Follow-up Report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At a meeting to plan next steps in software development in January 2013, college representatives met with an LACCD Information Technology manager and five involved programmers to discuss the identified areas in which to focus future development. These include the ability to attach and upload documents to program reviews and design of the roll-over capability. (p 21) • 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. (p 26) • 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. (p 26) • The PIE Committee is also charged with guiding the college, through the appropriate committees, in evaluating progress towards the goals of the Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan, Student Services Plan, and Facilities Plan, in part by using the results of program review. (p 26)
3. Which committees should be involved in what we should be doing now? (Note what they should be doing.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIE Committee - manage and evaluate the program review system; meet with Budget Committee to do annual evaluations of the effective use of resources, and of the effectiveness of West’s planning and budgeting processes. • Technology Committee – evaluate progress in meeting the goals of the Technology Plan • Facilities Committee – evaluate progress in meeting the goals of the Facilities Plan • Student Services Council – evaluate progress in meeting the goals of the Student Services Plan
4. Which college employees have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice Presidents – who co-chair Technology and Facilities Committees, and the Student

<p>responsibility for what we should be doing now?</p>	<p>Services Council; and who prepare and validate program reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deans – who prepare and validate Division program reviews • Faculty Leaders – who participate in these committees and in Academic Senate, which shares responsibility for updating the Educational Master Plan • Committee Chairs -
<p>5. What evidence did we use in our presentations to the Commission or visiting team?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee minutes • planning documents • policy and procedures manuals • process diagrams • data • program review reports • survey results.
<p>6. What evidence might we use in the Midterm report? (Include evidence we should be collecting, as well as what is already available.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee minutes • planning documents • policy and procedures manuals • process diagrams • data • program review reports • EMP Newsletter • workshop evaluations • survey results