2008 LACCD Accreditation Progress Report Summary

Below is a summary of the outcomes and new reporting requirements for the Seaside and Valleyside colleges as the result of their spring 2008 progress reports:

- LAHC  Progress report accepted with two follow-up progress reports and visit
- LAMC  Progress report accepted with follow-up progress report and visit
- Pierce Progress report accepted with follow-up progress report
- LASC  Progress Report accepted: placed on probation with a follow-up report and visit
- LAVC  Progress Report accepted with scheduled progress report and follow-up report
- WLAC  Progress Report accepted

Los Angeles Harbor College

Status: Accepted Progress Report with additional follow-up report & visit


First Follow-Up Report with Visit due October 15, 2008 (All issues resolved by Jan. 2009)

Recommendation 2: Planning & Budget
The College needs to develop an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. This should be based in deep analysis of District and institutional research provided data and assure a broad involvement and participation in the institutional planning cycle (IB1).

Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes
Using the planning process and the governance process the College should construct a meaningful dialogue about student learning which assures understanding and infusion of Student Learning Outcomes. This dialogue should rely on robust information focused on the accomplishment of students as defined in program, inter-departmental, and institutional student learning outcomes. The team suggests that the College revisit the Commission’s definition of dialogue and description of Shaping the Dialogue for assistance. (IB1, IB2, IB4, IIA1c).

Recommendation 4: Program Review Processes
In making public the process of program review as well as the results the College will regularly and in a timely manner review and update policy, planning, and procedure manuals (IB3, IB5, IB6, IB7).

Recommendation 6: District/College Functions & Decentralization
The functional relationship between the College and District needs to be fully defined through a dialog focused on efficient use of resources and service to students. The implementation of a decentralized relationship needs mutual definition. (IVB3a, c).

Mid-term Report due March 15, 2009

Commission Recommendation 1: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability (New)
The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution. (Standard III.D.1.c).
Los Angeles Mission College

Status: Progress Report Accepted with follow-up report & visit

Midterm Report due March 15, 2010

Follow-Up Report with visit due March 1, 2009 (All issues resolved by June 2009)

Recommendation 2: College Governance
It is commendable that the college crafted and approved a new governance model. However, the model is untested and will require a commitment to the tenets of participatory governance to make it successful and useful to the college decision-making process. The team recommends that the areas of responsibility be defined to clarify the outcomes of any given governance process (Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3).

Recommendation 3: Evaluation and Effectiveness of Governance Committees
The team recommends that the College Council implement the regular and systematic evaluation of the effectiveness and integrity of its collaborative governance committees by fall 2008 (Standard IV.A.5).

Recommendation 7: District Progress on SLOs & Faculty Evaluation
The team recommends that the District should provide leadership in supporting the progress toward incorporating achievement of stated student learning outcomes as a component of faculty evaluation (Standard III.A.1.c).

(Commission Note: With regard to Recommendation 7 above, the Commission notes that the standard cited (III.A.1.c) also assigns this responsibility to “others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes.”)

Recommendation 8: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability
The team recommends that the college should closely monitor in future years the success of the District’s plan for addressing retiree health benefit liability to assure that out-year obligations are met without significant impact on the financial health of the institution (Standard III.D.1.c).

(Commission Note: With regard to Recommendation 8 above, the Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution.)

Commission Concern 2: Eligibility Requirement 19—Accountability
The Commission requires that the College demonstrate in the Progress Report that it is in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 19 which requires that “The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.”
Pierce College

Status:  Progress Report Accepted with follow-up report

Focused Midterm Report due March 15, 2010  (All issues resolved by June 2009)

Follow-Up Report—due March 15, 2009

Commission Recommendation 1: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability (New)
The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered
to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year
obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution.
(Standard III.D.1.c).

Focused Midterm Report—due March 1, 2010

Recommendation 1:  Planning & Budget
Although the college has created and initiated a new program planning process, there should be a
concerted effort to communicate the results of the planning process campus-wide and clearly
demonstrate a link between institutional planning and resource allocation. (I.B.1, I.B.2)

Recommendation 2:  Student Learning Outcome Assessment Planning
The college has done an admirable job initiating a student learning outcomes process at the
course level; however, efforts will need to be made to clarify campus leadership, articulate a
vision for the outcomes process as a whole, and develop a coherent and comprehensive system to
monitor progress and ensure the quality of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) efforts. (I.B.3)

Recommendation 3:  Faculty Tech Development (Special Emphasis)
Faculty development programs in instructional technology need to be offered in order to enable faculty
to expand the Distance Education course offerings.  (IIA.2.d)

Recommendation 4:  Student Learning Outcomes
SLOs need to be developed and assessed for all courses and programs on a regular basis and the results
used to improve institutional effectiveness.  (IIA.2.b, IIA.2.e, IIA.2.f)

Recommendation 6:  Deferred Maintenance
The college, in concert with the District, should develop a comprehensive long-term plan for
addressing the backlog of deferred maintenance projects which, if left unattended, may
compromise the quality of the student learning environment.  (III.B.1a, III.B.1b)

Recommendation 7:  Technology Planning (Special Emphasis)
The college should build on the current technology proposal with input from all constituencies to
develop a technology plan to articulate institutional priorities in addressing technology needs.  A
primary focus should be expanding the distance education (DE) program, improving student
learning outcomes, and providing technical support for faculty and students.  (III.C.1.a)
Los Angeles Southwest College

Status: Progress Report Accepted: Placed on Probation with follow-up report & visit

Midterm Report due March 15, 2009 with visit (All issues resolved by June 2009)

Recommendation 1: Non-instructional Program Review—Although the college has made significant progress in the program review process of instructional programs, the team recommends, as did the team in 2000, that the college implement a program review process, different from unit planning, for non-instructional programs including student services to evaluate their effectiveness and assist in planning (Standards IB.1, IB.2, IB.3, IIB.3, IIB.3.c, II.B3.e, II.B4, II.C2, IVA.1, IVA.2a, IVA.2b, IVA.3).

(Commission Note: Regarding recommendation #1 above, the Commission acknowledges the extensive work in the area of instructional program reviews that LASC has completed and requests a report on the non-instructional program review areas.)

Recommendation 2: Student Success Plan
The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan to address the problems of low retention, persistence, and success rates of students who enter the college without sufficient academic preparation (Standards IA.1, IB.7, IIA.2d, IIB.1, IIB.2, IIID.1, IVA.5).

Recommendation 3: Institutional Effectiveness
The team has found that there is a divergence between plans and subsequent action. Therefore, the team recommends that the college focus greater attention on assessing the currency and effectiveness of all programs and services with particular emphasis on the following areas:

a. staff development
b. distance learning
c. technology
d. enrollment management and
e. occupational education

The team further recommends that the college incorporate the identified needs and adopted action plans into the Integrated College Operational Plan (Standards IA.1, IB.3, IB.7, IIA.1a, IIA.1b, IIA.2b, IIA.2c, IIA.2f, IIA.3, IIA.5, IIB.3, IIC.1, IIC.2).

(Commission Note: Regarding recommendation #3 above, President Daniels has indicated that the college’s California Benchmarking Project Committee has plans to draft a summative report from an analysis of the available data on LASC and use that information to update the college’s Staff Development Plan in the fall of 2008. The Commission will expect to see evidence of that work at the time of the March 2009 report with visit.)

Recommendation 4: Changing Demographics
There is no clear evidence that the college has developed specific strategies to meet the educational needs of the changing demographics of its community. The team recommends that the college intensify its efforts to identify service area needs. The team further recommends that the college develop and implement plans for programs, courses, and services to address identified needs (Standards IA.1, IIA.1a, IB.3a, II.B.4, IIB.1, IIB.2, IIID.1).

Commission Concern 1: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability (New)
The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution.
Los Angeles Valley College

Status: Progress Report Accepted with additional follow-up report

Midterm Report due March 15, 2010 (All issues resolved by June 2009)

Previously Scheduled Progress Report due October 15, 2008

Recommendation 2: Integration of Planning Processes
The team recommends that the college strengthen, document with narrative, and disseminate the integration of all its planning processes. These processes should incorporate evaluation, improvement and re-evaluation, as needed, of all its programs and services. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.f, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.B.2.b)

Recommendation 3: Development & Assessment of SLOs
The team recommends that the college accelerate the continued development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, certificate and degree levels to ensure continuous improvement. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.3, IV.B.2.b)
(Commission Note: With regard to Recommendation 3, the Commission notes that all colleges are expected to now be at the development level on the Commission’s Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness and at the proficiency level by 2012.)

Recommendation 4: Current Deficit and Plans for Future Financial Stability
The team recommends that the college take action to address the current $1.9 million deficit immediately and develop plans to establish financial stability in the long term to ensure fiscal responsibility and accountability. (Standards III.D.2.c, IV.B.2.d)

Recommendation 5: Communication and Participation in Decision-Making
The team recommends that the college implement its planning agenda regarding communication and participation in the decision-making process and evaluate its implementation and overall effectiveness. (Standard IV.A.1.b)

Additional Follow-Up Report due March 15, 2009

Commission Recommendation 1: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability (New)
The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution. (Standard III.D.1.c).
West Los Angeles College

Status: Accepted Progress Report

Midterm Report due March 15, 2009 (All issues resolved by March 2009)

Commission Recommendation 1: Planning Effectiveness (New)
The Commission is seeking evidence of the effectiveness of the various plans that the College has implemented and the sustainability of the College’s planning processes. (Standard I.6)

Commission Recommendation 2: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability (New)
The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution. (Standard III.D.1.c).

Recommendation 1: Campus Climate
The college should create a campus climate that embraces open, candid dialogue that embodies a culture of respect, civility and trust to improve institutional decision making, planning and effectiveness. (Standard I.B.1; Standard III.A.1.d, III.A.4, III.A.4.c.; and Standard IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Recommendation 2: Student Learning Outcomes
The college should identify student learning outcomes at the course and program levels, and refine them at the institutional level, while adhering to the defined timeline and monitoring timely development within each department. These student learning outcomes should be systematically assessed and the results used for the improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness. (Standard I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.7; Standard II.A.1.c. II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.f, II.2.h, II.2.i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.1.a, II.C.2; Standard III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c; and Standard IV.A.1, IV.A.2.b, IV.B.1.b)

Recommendation 3: Budget Plan
The college should implement a viable plan to operate in a fiscally responsible fashion that aligns its programs and services with its revenue allocation to achieve sustainable fiscal stability. (Standard III.B)

Recommendation 4: District Budget Allocation Model
The district should evaluate the impact of the revenue allocation model and consider the special conditions of individual colleges (Standards III.D, Standard IV.B)

Recommendation 5: Planning and Budget
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 ambitions planning agenda. (Standard I.A.4, I.B).

Recommendation 6: Student Services/Counseling Unit
The college should periodically review its staffing practices, hours of operation, and counseling priorities to ensure that what is delivered is consistent with program review, of acceptable quality, and aligns with the mission and values of the college. (Standard II.B.1)
Recommendation 7: Library Resources
The college should address the inadequacy of its library collections. (Standard II.C.1)

Recommendation 8: Staffing Plan
The college should assess its staffing needs and organizational structure and implement a plan that effectively allocates its human resources. (Standard III.A.1, III.A.2, III.A.6)

Recommendation 9: Employee Evaluations
The college should complete and maintain scheduled employee evaluations. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Recommendation 10: Technology Planning
The college should adopt a fully integrated planning and budgeting process that focuses on promoting student learning, includes a technology plan that provides an equitable distribution of information technology, and includes the total cost of ownership for technology. (Standard III.C.2)

Recommendation 11: Financial Stability
The college should assign a high priority to attaining long-term financial stability. (Standard III.D)

Recommendation 12: Enrollment Management
The college should develop and execute enrollment management strategies to achieve stable enrollment and growth. (Standard III.D)

Recommendation 13: Governance
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)

Recommendation 14: District/College Functions & Decentralization
The functional relationship between the College and District needs to be fully defined through a dialog focused on efficient use of resources and service to students. The implementation of a decentralized relationship needs mutual definition. (IVB3a, c).