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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

Response to the Request of the Commission in the Action Letter

Recommendation 1
“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.”

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.”

Recommendation 4 from 2000
“The College should develop and evaluate strategies to ensure the communication, use and integration of existing and planned research and evaluation throughout the college community. This will further efforts to develop a process where decisions are based on a culture of evidence.”

Recommendation 5
“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.”

Recommendation 6 from 2006
“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.”

Recommendation 9
“The College should complete and maintain scheduled employee evaluations.”
CONTEXT FOR WEST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE’S REPORT PREPARATION

Less than two weeks after the Commission’s letter of June 29, 2006, which reaffirmed West’s accreditation, Dr. Mark W. Rocha took office on July 10, 2006, as West’s new and permanent president following a national search.

Dr. Rocha had previously been interim Vice President of Academic Affairs at the Los Angeles Community College District’s (LACCD) Mission College. A practicing English teacher for nearly thirty years, Dr. Rocha took his Ph.D. in English from the University of Southern California. Dr. Rocha brought his sensibility as a faculty member and experience in academic administration to lead West. Under Dr. Rocha’s leadership, enrollment has increased for the first time in three years, the administration has stabilized and filled both vacant vice president positions and the system of shared governance has operated successfully and collegially. There is a renewed sense that West is moving forward in the right direction and has a bright future. Dr. Rocha and West are a good fit.

The faculty, staff and administration studied the Commission’s letter of June 29, 2006, and established two goals as essential prerequisites for making progress on the recommendations of the Commission:

1. Strengthen West’s shared governance by implementing a genuine system of participatory decision making rather than one of merely ceremonial consultation.
2. Create a durable policy and process for the Progress Report that would institutionalize this year’s Progress Report process as a permanent process of continuous quality control and improvement rather than one of mere compliance.

The documented evidence of our work over the past eight months demonstrates that West accomplished its mission on both counts.

THE DECISION TO FOCUS AND PRIORITIZE OUR WORK

The Commission’s letter of June 29, 2006, reaffirmed the accreditation of West. In this letter the Commission further requested a Progress Report due by March 15, 2007. The Commission directed that this Progress Report “should focus on the institution’s resolution of the recommendations and concerns as noted below.” These stated concerns in the letter of June 29, 2006, were: Recommendations 1, 5, 6, 9 and 13. Additionally, the Commission asked us to report progress on Recommendation 4 from the 2000 evaluation.

While West has indeed made substantial documented progress on each of the Commission’s thirteen recommendations, this report focuses on the documented progress on the six specific recommendations in the Commission’s letter of June 29. We are grateful to the Commission for this focus since it guided our priorities for improvement.
Summary of Events and Timeline of the Progress Report

The process for preparing and producing the Progress Report began officially in July 2006. On July 17, 2006, two weeks after his arrival at West Los Angeles College, the college president sent an all-campus “Save the Date” email announcing an Accreditation Review Meeting for Thursday, July 27, 2006, at 9 am.

On July 25, 2006, the college resident sent an email reminder to “all interested members of the faculty and staff” to attend the meeting of July 27, 2006. The Liaison to the Chancellor would also attend.

At the meeting of July 27, 2006, the agenda included the following:
1. Welcome and Introductions (West’s president)
2. Official Commendation and Congratulations on Reaffirmation of Accreditation
3. Report on Update to the Board of Trustees on Wednesday, July 26. (Senate president, faculty chair of accreditation)
4. Distribution, Review and Discussion of Recommendations by ACCJC (Chancellor’s Liaison)
5. Identification of Tasks to Implement the Commission’s Recommendations
6. Establishment of a Work Schedule/Timeline for Completion of the Required Progress Report
7. Next Meeting and Fall Meeting Schedule

After this meeting, the college president met with faculty leadership, including the Academic Senate president, the chair of the AFT Staff Guild chapter and the faculty chair of accreditation to propose an agreed-upon Process for Producing the Accreditation Progress Report due March 15, 2007. Twenty-one administrators, faculty and staff attended the August 17, 2006, meeting to finalize this document.

The document specifies four Recommendations’ Committees, working committees, “that will focus on progressive actions for each of the six key recommendations under the leadership of chairs and co-chairs pro tem.” Each Recommendation Committee was charged with identifying “specific actions that can be taken in the Fall semester to address the substance of the Commission’s recommendations so that the final progress report is written in the past tense, e.g. We did this....”

The proposed Recommendation Committee structure included the following:

i. Committee for Recommendations #1 and #13 (Governance, etc.)
ii. Recommendations #5 and #4/2000 (Planning, etc.)
iii. Recommendation #6 (Staffing, Counseling, etc.)
iv. Recommendation #9 (Employee Evaluations)

The Steering Committee pro tem’s membership includes the following: College President, Academic Senate President, AFT Faculty Guild Chair, Accreditation Self-Study Faculty Chair, Accreditation Liaison Officer and the ASO President or designee. Charged with
providing continuing leadership, this group would supervise policy and procedure, e.g., the search for a compensated faculty chair, the appointment of an editing committee, etc.

The agreed-upon process also set forth a meeting schedule for the Fall 2006 semester through the first months of 2007. Recommendation chairs and co-chairs solicited committee members from groups such as the faculty, the Staff Guild and other staff and administrators. Committees met throughout the Fall semester and focused on their specific recommendations, following the charge to identify precise actions that address their recommendation(s).

To keep the college apprised of developments related to the Progress Report, this item appeared regularly on the agendas of the College Council, the College Planning Committee and the Academic Senate. The faculty chair also addressed the Staff Guild, the AFT Faculty Guild and the Divisional Council at one of their meetings. Weekly updates on the Progress Report appeared in the President’s Bulletin throughout the Fall semester. The Accreditation website has been updated on a regular basis with Progress Report news.

In an effort to inform the college community of progress made on the recommendations, the Steering Committee and college president held a Town Hall meeting of Hearing Moments and Conversation on Tuesday, October 31, 2006. Fifty-seven administrators, faculty, staff and students signed in for this event, featuring presentations by each of the Recommendations’ Committees’ chairs and co-chairs. Conversations did occur and observations were shared, captured and reported back to the college in the form of Town Hall Meeting Notes (see Appendix).

According to the timeline established, a draft of the Progress Report was distributed at the November 14, 2006, Academic Senate meeting. Senators were asked to share the report with their constituents and to solicit feedback to share with the Steering Committee. The draft Progress Report was also posted at the Accreditation page of the college website and copies were made available at the Reserve Desk of the library and upon request.

Another Town Hall Meeting was held on December 7, 2006, with twenty participants who signed in. Discussion of the recommendations proceeded, and detailed notes of this meeting were emailed to the college community (see Appendix).

Opportunities to engage in conversation and discussion were numerous and varied. Through the Recommendations’ Committees’ membership and these efforts to disseminate the draft report widely to key committees and groups in a timely way, the college community was invited to participate actively in the shaping of the final Progress Report, including thoughtful e-mailed responses from faculty in the Appendix to the draft Progress Report.

**Where We Go From Here**

The hallmark achievement documented in this report is the permanent institutionalization of accreditation as a permanent process for improving student success outcomes.
West has come to terms with creating a culture of evidence and, for example, has embraced the data published by the recent AB1417 ARCC Report (Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges) as the basis for its own mission goals (see Appendix). West will use this baseline data as a way to measure future progress toward its goal of becoming the best community college in its peer group in every student success category. By at least one measure West does not have far to go: West’s course completion rate of 81.7% for vocational courses is among the highest in our peer group. While West, like all urban community colleges, of course has room for improvement in student success outcomes, in the majority of ARCC categories the college’s current ARCC performance data are at or near the peer averages for all the LACCD and surrounding colleges.

West Los Angeles College is therefore grateful to the Commission for this opportunity to report its progress toward achieving its mission-based goals of helping ever more of its students realize their dreams for success.
RECOMMENDATIONS’ COMMITTEES’ MEMBERS AND PROCESSES

Recommendations Numbers 1 and 13 Committee

Committee members:
Eloise M. Crippens, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President, Counseling
Olga Shewfelt, Co-Chair, AFT Faculty President, Political Science
Chuck Amaugo, Financial Aid
Robert Irving, Ph.D., Psychology
Gerald Ludwig, Business
Abel Rodriguez, SEIU LOCAL 347
Jan Vanderpool, Business

The committee met on 10.4.06, 10.18.06, 11.8.06, and 11.22.06 and presented a draft Progress Report at the Town Hall meetings of 10.31.06 and 12.7.06.

The committee agreed to have agendas and minutes for each meeting and to post them for the entire college at the college website. During meetings, the committee’s discussion centered on how to infuse civility, respect and trust into our colleagues, and how to involve more faculty and staff actively in the shared governance process. The committee gave each member a homework assignment to visit at least one shared governance committee and observe how civility, respect and trust were functioning in each committee. Each member discussed his/her observations and felt that West was moving in a positive direction; however, one member felt that each committee he attended needed an infusion of civility, respect and trust. The committee received his minority report.

Recommendations Numbers 4/2000 and 5 Committee

Committee members:
Fran Leonard, Faculty Chair of the Progress Report and Chair of the Recommendations 4/2000 & 5 Committee, English
Nikki Jacobson, Director, Paralegal Studies
Clyde Titus, Business
Lloyd Thomas, Ph.D., Director of Title V Grant, English
John Oester, Vice President of Administrative Services, Administration
Edward Pai, Ph.D., Research Analyst, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Geneat Walton, AFT Staff Guild

The committee met on 9.5.06, 9.19.06, 10.3.06, 10.17.06, 11.7.06 and 11.21.06 and presented a draft Progress Report at the Town Hall meetings of 10.31.06 and 12.7.06.

The committee formed early in the Fall semester, developed a formal agenda and approved minutes for each meeting. Meetings were announced in the President’s Bulletin to encourage members of the college community to attend. To keep the college community informed of the work of this committee, minutes were posted at the college website and
regular reports made to the College Planning Committee, the Academic Senate and the College Council.

Committee members contributed to the work of this committee by reading and discussing the relevant sections of the self-study report and the evaluation report as we proceeded to identify key action plans to address Recommendations 4 and 5. Using a set of questions developed and agreed upon by the committee, the committee’s four faculty members interviewed division chairs regarding the usefulness of data in this cycle of program review as well as the effectiveness of program review for their divisions. The results were reported to the committee and recommendations considered to further improve the next cycle of program review.

**Recommendation Number 6 Committee**

Members:

Sherron Rouzan, Co-Chair, Chair of Counseling
Yvonne Simone, Co-Chair, Child Development Center Director
Patricia Banday, Ph.D., Maticulation Coordinator
Scott Feinerman, Director of International Students
Frank Gonzales, Dean of EOP&S, Administration
Paul Stansbury, Ed.D., Vice President of Academic Affairs, Administration
John Workman, Ph.D., Counselor

The committee met on 9.7.06, 9.14.06, 10.5.06, 10.12.06, 11.13.06, 12.19.06 and 1.25.07 and presented a PowerPoint presentation at the Town Hall meeting of 10.31.06 with further discussion taking place at the Town Hall meeting of 12.7.06.

To address Recommendation 6, the committee began meeting in September 2006. Committee members’ schedules and unanticipated events caused changes in the committee’s meeting schedule. Written work and minutes were communicated via email and posted at the college website. Initially, the committee focused on clarifying the student services and counseling issues from the evaluation of the self study. Related discussions also took place within the counseling division and action items incorporated in the counseling program review document.
Recommendation Number 9 Committee

Members:

Rod Patterson, Co-Chair, Political Science
Bob Sprague, Co-Chair, Director of Title V Grant, English
Fran Leonard, Faculty Chair and Resource Person, English
Maria Luisa Mateo, Ph.D., Academic Affairs, Administration
Christina Misner, AFT Staff Guild
Olga Shewfelt, AFT Faculty President, Political Science
Paul Stansbury, Ed.D., ALO, Administration
Hansel Tsai, Administrative Service, Personnel Office

The committee met on 9.21.06, 10.5.06, 10.12.06, 10.19.06 and 11.9.06 and presented a draft Progress Report at the Town Hall meetings of 10.31.06 and 12.7.06.

The committee developed a formal agenda and approved minutes for each meeting. To assist the college community in communications, awareness, and involvement in the issues related to the Committee’s work, minutes were posted on the website and placed on reserve at the library. The meetings were scheduled and posted in the President’s Bulletin in advance of each meeting. The agenda had a “public speakers” item for each meeting. The co-chairs called division chairs, ex-division chairs, interested faculty and staff to let them know about the meetings and the agenda, and the committee did have some guests during its meetings.
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATION 1

Recommendation and Analysis

Recommendation 1: 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.

As charged by the college president, the Recommendation 1 Committee identified the following key action plans to address in the Fall 2006 semester:

- To create college strategies that promote an open campus climate and foster a culture of respect, civility and trust
- To improve institutional decision-making and effectiveness by clarifying the college’s shared governance structure, sponsoring team-building events and sharing the best available information with all constituencies
- To improve overall institutional accountability

Recommendation 1 from the 2006 accreditation evaluation is being met. The college strategies to create a campus climate that fosters a culture of respect, civility and trust to improve institutional decision-making and effectiveness have been two-fold. First of all, the college has continued to strengthen and clarify the shared governance structure by sponsoring team-building events, sharing the best available information with all constituencies and seeking agreements on college-wide matters through the College Council and other appropriate bodies, as the evidence presented in the outcomes section of this report points out.

To lead this effort, the new permanent college president, Dr. Mark Rocha, has made a public commitment to embrace and practice an open and respectful dialogue with all college constituencies. He has initiated a practice of presenting regular written reports to the College Council, the Academic Senate, the AFT faculty and other constituencies. His commitment to serve the students and to bring everybody together to work as a team is having a positive effect on the college. This is evidenced by activities such as the Welcome Week in the Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 semesters, the themes of “Save One” and the “I Am West” buttons, which staff, administrators, faculty and students wear with pride. The college leaders and their constituencies also have renewed their commitment to improve our participatory governance practices by inviting everyone on campus to participate in regularly scheduled meetings, sponsoring college-wide events, and disseminating relevant information, such as the college budget, on a regular basis to the campus community.
**Progress to Date**

**Team-Building Strategies and their Outcomes**

College strategies that promote a culture of respect, civility and trust recognize that creating such a culture takes time and concerted effort on the part of leaders and participants in governance. Efforts include the Spring 2006 Leadership Retreat with its emphasis on team-building approaches and group work exercises (1.1). This was followed by the very well-attended Fall 2006 semester Leadership Retreat, which addressed the issues of college ethics, and adopted a preliminary assessment on potential updates and revision to West’s Educational Master Plan (EMP) (1.2).

**Mutual Agreement Reached**

To improve communication and consultation, the college president and the presidents of the Academic Senate and the AFT faculty have met on a weekly basis since September 2006. As a result of these meetings, the college leadership reached agreement on several important issues. One of these is the Mutual Agreement on the process and procedures for the development of the Accreditation Progress Report (1.3), drafted through consultation by the college president with faculty leaders and two meetings held in July and August of 2006. College leadership also reached agreement on the collaborative organization model with three (not two) vice presidents (1.4).

Other accomplishments include the ratification of The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Concerning Effective College Governance Process, which addressed and clarified the following: the charge to the College Planning Committee, the distinction between policy and operations, streamlining implementation of the Facilities Plan of the college Master Plan and charging the Academic Senate with the updating of the college’s Educational Master Plan (1.5).

**Sharing of Information**

Presentations of the complete college budget for 2006-07 were made and copies given to all constituencies in the College Council and the Budget Committee for greater transparency and also to assist policy-setters and decision-makers (1.6). At meetings of the College Council, Academic Senate and AFT faculty, the college president provides written reports and communicates his themes of “Save One,” “Actual as opposed to ceremonial consultation,” “Policy as differentiated from operations” (1.7).

In Fall 2006, the Associated Students Organization (ASO) produced, published and distributed the college newsletter with the help of a new Associated Students Organization advisor, which emphasized accuracy, presented a greater variety of articles of interest to the college community and featured more student writers than were previously involved (1.8).
Improving Overall Institutional Accountability

To improve institutional accountability, the college has focused on completing outstanding staff evaluations across the college during the Fall 2006 semester. The report of the Recommendation 9 committee speaks directly to this issue with evidence of progress documented in that report.

With regard to re-assigned time, the faculty leadership, in consultation with the college president, has agreed to look at all re-assigned time assignments to assess their value to the college and to evaluate the effectiveness of these assignments.

Future Plans 2007-08

- To continue the regular and complete flow of information from the administration to all constituencies through the College Council and other appropriate bodies in order to strengthen the college’s decision-making process.
- To establish a master calendar of college events posted on the college web page to avoid scheduling conflicts.
- To schedule workshops on civility, open dialogue and respect in the workplace.
- To increase accountability for evening offerings by assigning an evening certificated administrator to enforce rules and regulations and to respond to the concerns of evening faculty and students.

Documentation for Recommendation 1

1.1 College Leadership Retreat report and evaluation, May and June 2006
1.2 College Leadership Retreat report December 18, 2006
1.3 The Mutual Agreement on the process and procedures for the development of the Accreditation Progress Report
1.4 The collaborative organization model with three (not two) vice presidents
1.5 MOU on Effective Governance. College Council document CC906-1 September 26, 2006
1.6 College Budget 2006-07. College Council documents and minutes, September and October 2006
1.7 West’s President reports to College Council, Academic Senate and AFT faculty Fall 2006
1.8 The “Student Voice “ newsletter published in November 2006
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATION 13

Recommendation and Analysis

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.

As charged by the college president, the Committee on Recommendation 13 developed the following key action plans for Fall 2006 semester:

- Develop strategies for conducting meaningful, timely dialogue
- Increase recruitment and appointment of faculty in college governance
- Increase student participation

Recommendation 13 from the 2006 accreditation evaluation is being met. The college recognizes that increasing participation in governance can only be accomplished when trust develops throughout the institution. To this end, West deliberately created opportunities that would appeal to the college community’s interests and where meaningful, timely dialogue could occur.

Progress to Date

Conducting Meaningful, Timely Dialogue

The college strategies to increase meaningful, timely and open dialogue and participation have proceeded in several ways. The college held two college-wide Town Hall meetings on the Accreditation Progress Report, one on October 31 and the other on December 7, 2006. A total of ninety-four people participated in these meetings and heard reports by each recommendation committee’s chair and co-chair on the key action plans to address the recommendations. A number of participants also provided feedback on the recommendations addressed in this progress report. The notes from these Town Hall meetings are included in the Appendix to this report. One issue discussed at the Town Hall meeting in December was how to deal with dissenting opinions. While the group did not reach agreement, the topic generated meaningful discussion both face-to-face and in email correspondence (13.1 and Appendix).

Involving more faculty and increasing opportunities for meaningful dialogue included concerted efforts to have division chairs schedule division meetings for their faculty. At least eight of the twelve academic divisions held regular meetings with both full-time and adjunct faculty in the Fall 2006 semester, a marked improvement over past practice (13.2).

Finally, to improve communication with adjunct faculty, an additional open hour was scheduled in the evening (13.3).
Increased Participation

The college has engaged in a serious effort to expand the number of participants in relevant college discussions as evidenced not only in the two Town Hall meetings, but also in the “Project Turn Around Now” feedback. This project addresses three key college challenges: budget, enrollment growth and retention. This process included college-wide discussion over two months with broad participation of all college constituencies through the College Council and other appropriate bodies. Further discussion and feedback for this project were obtained in the meeting of faculty with the LACCD Chancellor in December 2006 (13.4).

Increased participation included the recruiting and appointing of new administrators, faculty and staff to college committees, such as the Recommendations’ Committees for the progress report, the College Council and the Selection Committee for the Vice President of Student Services. Other committees with new members included the Work Environment Committee, the Budget Committee, the Program Review and Comprehensive Program Review Committees and the Distance Learning Committee. The Academic Senate adopted term-limits for faculty serving as Senate’s representatives in order to generate broader participation. Lots were drawn to determine which faculty member would have a one-year term versus a two-year term on each committee. In addition, the recent selection of a new Vice President of Student Affairs is expected to infuse and broaden the participation of students in governance and other relevant college issues (13.5, 13.6, and 13.7).

A good number of faculty who are normally reluctant to participate on committees nevertheless got involved in other activities during the Fall 2006 semester, including Welcome Week, One Stop Registration and Jitters Week, offering a variety of workshops to students to ease their anxieties about taking finals. While not examples of involvement in governance, these examples do signal a greater willingness on the part of some of the reluctant faculty to contribute in other meaningful ways to student success in addition to teaching their classes (13.8).

Even as these opportunities draw from a wider range of faculty, the faculty leadership and the college recognize that there are those who were and still remain critical of these efforts. Nonetheless, efforts to address Recommendation 13 will continue.

Future Plans

- Schedule regular monthly meetings of all academic divisions with participation of full-time faculty and invitation of adjunct instructors
- Focus on strategies to increase student representation on the College Council, and other college-wide committees
- Continue to increase recruitment and appointment of new people in college governance
- Schedule annual workshops on shared governance decision-making process
**Documentation for Recommendation 13**

13.1 Town Hall meetings October 31, and December 7, 2006, notes and reports – see Appendix

13.2 Academic Divisions meetings, Fall 2006

13.3 New hour of President’s meetings with adjunct faculty. President’s Bulletin, November 2006

13.4 “Project Turn Around Now” proposal and discussions. College Council documents and minutes, Fall 2006. AFT faculty minutes and notes on meeting with LACCD Chancellor December 12, 2006

13.5 College-wide committees’ membership list

13.6 Academic Senate minutes Fall 2006

13.7 Selection and appointment of the new VP of Student Services to start in the Spring 2007 semester

13.8 Jitters Room Schedule
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATION 4 FROM 2000

Recommendation and Analysis

Recommendation 4 from 2000: The college should develop and evaluate strategies to ensure the communication, use and integration of existing and planned research and evaluation throughout the college community. This will further efforts to develop a process where decisions are based on a culture of evidence.

West Los Angeles College recognizes the importance of a culture of evidence to inform decisions. To address Recommendation 4 from 2000, the college has developed strategies that include the following key action plans to use planned research effectively and consistently:

- Integrate research and data in the college’s program review process
- Train program review authors, other decision makers and policy setters in understanding and analysis of data
- Make data available at college website and other venues for key governance committees
- Use data to make decisions regarding resource allocation tied to strategic goals

Progress to Date

Communication, use and integration of existing and planned research and evaluation

To implement Commission recommendations, West’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness supports the college’s strategies to ensure the communication, use and integration of planned research and evaluation.

At the program review workshop of August 22, 2006, academic chairs were oriented to the Data Book, focusing particularly on enrollment data for each division, since enrollment growth has been identified as the key college goal this year (4.1). The college researcher encouraged academic division chairs to meet with him to better understand how to read and analyze the data. Many opted to do this (4.2 Chair meetings with researcher). Based on the feedback from the chairs who met with the college researcher, the college now knows that scheduling individual sessions is an effective training strategy for furthering a culture of evidence.

Student and Administrative Services’ Data included:
- 2005 Student Survey
- Budget Data 2004-2007

At the program review workshop of September 29, 2006, for Student and Administrative Services and the President’s Office, all participants were similarly oriented to the appropriate data sets listed here:
- KPIs for Student Services
- KPIs for Administrative Services
- IPEDS Summary (Federal Dept. of Education data)
- Sample AB1417 reports (state-legislated accountability reporting)
- Several relevant District reports

Another strategy for communicating, using and integrating research includes making carefully compiled, relevant data available through the college website: http://www.wlac.edu/oie/index.html (4.3 college website). Among the data available at this site, one can access, for example, the following information:

- Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges, summary, comparisons
  - WLAC 2005-2006 Annual Summary (updated 9/16/06)
- WLAC/SMC [Santa Monica College], ECC [El Camino College]
  - Comparison: A Report by Marketing Consultants, Fall 2005
  - District Student Survey
- Leadership Retreat Summaries, 2003-2006
- 2006-2007 Program Review Data Books for academic units, administrative and student services units (October 2006)
- Research Responses to Ad-hoc Reports, including class size average, online and on-ground, by division, and Math 125 repeat analysis 2000-2005

Members of key policy-making committees and senior staff can find there the Institutional Performance and Accountability data, which includes degrees and certificates awarded from 1978 to 2004, for example. Information-sharing through the enhanced college website features a web page for key committees, including schedules of meetings, members and meeting agendas and approved minutes. More than half the content now on the college website did not exist this time last year.

Efforts to familiarize the college with data and how to access data include the Town Hall meeting of October 31, 2006, Hearing Moments/Conversation on the Progress Report (4.4 Town Hall meeting). About sixty participants from the college community heard about the redesigned faculty/staff page, which provides resources to senior staff, division chairs, faculty, staff and students. The President’s Bulletin for the week of November 6, 2006, features directions to the Student Success resources on the faculty/staff homepage, including retention strategies such as “101 Things You Can Do in the First Three Weeks of Class” and “Online Retention and other Student Success Resources” (4.5 President’s Bulletin).

Sharing and disseminating of data is now becoming more commonplace at different venues where policy- and decision-making take place. At the AFT Faculty Guild meeting of October 26, 2006, participants received data from both the AFT Faculty Guild chapter president chairing the meeting and another set from its guest, the college president (4.6 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges [ARCC] and Assembly Bill [AB]1417).
This same data was also part of the materials given to over 100 participants at the Fall Leadership Retreat of November 3, 2006. The sharing of data is a new experience for many, but this practice continues, and as faculty, in particular, and other decision-makers become accustomed to reviewing and studying the data, this analysis will contribute meaningfully to evidence-based planning to enhance student learning.

The research effort, then, is well underway and is specifically addressing operational issues that contribute to institutional effectiveness. This effort comes at a crucial time: the passage of Assembly Bill 1417, the Performance Framework for California Community Colleges, which requires accountability reporting for community college districts and includes an academic performance index. This index looks at an institution’s retention, progress and success.

Examples of a process of decision-making based on a culture of evidence, including analysis and evaluation, leading to further improvement.

To further assist in the college’s efforts to improve, a Comprehensive Program Review timeline has been established for the entire college. These reports are evaluated by a subcommittee of the Program Review Committee, which reports its findings to the College Planning Committee. This year’s cycle of program review again served its purpose as a self-evaluative process. The revised instrument, with its additional SLO requirements and budget worksheet, helped academic division chairs better identify specific needs that are included in their unit plans. This deliberate design upgrade – promoted by the self-study effort – has made this particular process, an integral part of planning and resource allocation, more meaningful for those responsible for program review reports (4.7 Comprehensive Program Review chart and 4.8 Revised Program Review instruments).

Administrators, in particular, use data analysis in policy-setting and decision-making. One example is the college president’s set-aside for enrollment growth initiatives. The decision to focus on enrollment growth is dictated by a revenue-driven fiscal environment. As the college focuses on growing enrollment, it must consider other data as well: persistence, retention, academic and vocational goal attainment, among others. As the Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate begins its work on updating the Educational Master Plan, it will weigh opportunities and constraints and other relevant considerations.

College efforts to improve are often the result of actual experiences and the evaluation of these. The college’s continuing effort to address its budget deficit in order to meet students’ needs dictates that West focus on enrollment growth while maintaining its commitment to learning outcomes. In Fall 2006, in order to qualify for the set-aside funds, initiatives needed to be rooted in program review reports based on data analysis and the resultant unit plan. The program review coordinators drew up a short list of possible initiatives.

However, most items did not fully meet the criteria set by the College Planning Committee. Further analysis suggests that the current program review process does not align with the College Planning Committee’s criteria for enrollment growth initiatives. Accordingly, the
current instrument and process need to be retooled to include data that will help academic
division chairs and faculty better analyze which programs will yield enrollment growth for
West by providing students the education and training they will need to be competitive in
the world of work (4.9 College Planning Committee documents).

Another example of gathering data and information to improve the current program review
process includes the decision by the Recommendations 4 and 5 Committee to survey
division chairs in October 2006 using agreed-upon interview questions. The responses to
the questions yielded information on how to improve program review to ensure an even
more effective planning tool.

With regard to data, however, some academic chairs commented that data should be
provided in a form that reduces the need for time-consuming calculations. Others
discovered that the data specific to their disciplines/areas was incomplete or inaccurate.
Observations such as these are further proof that a culture of evidence is developing
gradually, and users are thinking critically about data qualitatively (4.10 Notes from
Interviews with Division Chairs). Implementing the online program review instrument in
July 2007 will address the shortcomings revealed in the current process.

Another key committee that looks at data is the Basic Skills Task Force, whose members
examine assessment, persistence, retention and Title V data. Analysis of this data is used in
scheduling of classes, improving recruitment or supporting basic skills efforts. Data has
also been used to allocate funds mainly in tutoring, staff development and supporting the
Title V efforts (4.11 Basic Skills Committee meeting minutes).

Data is also used by the Enrollment Management Committee and the Divisional Council,
whose members considered class size averages, all of which helps guide chairs in the
scheduling of classes. The Team for Advertising, Marketing, Outreach and Recruitment
(TAMOR), formed in Fall 2006 with representatives from matriculation, counseling,
admissions, financial aid and research, and is chaired by the Vice President of Academic
Affairs. TAMOR is using information from the District’s database to focus its marketing
message specifically to target groups, such as the 350 just-graduated high schoolers who
applied to West but did not enroll (4.12 TAMOR).

Efforts to share information with key governance bodies include the announcement by the
college president in Fall 2006 semester that the Vice President of Administrative Services
would make budget presentations at meetings of the College Council, the College Planning
Committee and the Budget Committee. The cover memo, titled “Budget Analysis,” clearly
summarized revenues and expenses from both the unrestricted and restricted general funds.
Updated 2006-07 projected expenses and revenue were part of the handouts for the
November 1, 2006, Budget Committee meeting. As this example illustrates, West Los
Angeles College is making progress in communicating, using and integrating key
information to decision-making governance bodies (4.13 Budget Presentations
documentation). How decision-making governance bodies use this information effectively
is the next step in a slowly evolving culture of evidence.
Finally, the college president has charged the Educational Policies and Standards Committee of the Academic Senate to draft an updated Educational Master Plan for West, focusing on two key factors from the District’s Strategic Master Plan: Student Success and Academic Excellence. As the committee proceeds with this work, the use of data will provide a key link between West’s Master Plan with the District’s Strategic Planning efforts and statewide accountability measures.

From the above examples, West is actively and deliberately building a culture of evidence to inform sound decision-making and planning as they relate to resource allocation. These efforts to incorporate data into the process of decision-making will lead to class offerings and academic program support to improve our student success outcomes as defined by the criteria of Assembly Bill 1417, Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges.

**Future Plans 2007-08**

- Implement an online program review in July 2007 with identified needed refinements to make these reports more accessible and transparent and to strengthen the links between planning and resource allocation
- Continue to refine data and make it more accessible and understandable for policy and decision-makers, leading to greater effectiveness, for example, in class offerings and academic program support to provide student learning aligned with workforce needs

**Documentation for Recommendation 4**

4.1 Data Book  [http://www.wlac.edu/oie/research.html](http://www.wlac.edu/oie/research.html)
4.2 Log of Chair meetings
4.3 College website  [http://www.wlac.edu/index.html](http://www.wlac.edu/index.html)
4.4 Sign-in sheet for the October 31, 2006 Town Hall Meeting – scanned, barely readable
4.5 President’s Bulletin of November 6, 2006 – paper only
4.6 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges AB 1417  
4.7 Program review instruments – paper only
4.8 Revised program review instruments  
[http://www.wlac.edu/programreview/index.html](http://www.wlac.edu/programreview/index.html)
4.9 Relevant minutes of the College Planning Committee  
[http://www.wlac.edu/planning/agendasandminutes.html](http://www.wlac.edu/planning/agendasandminutes.html)
4.10 Interviews with Chairs -- electronic copies
4.11 Basic Skills Task Force meeting minutes (filed under “links” on the following URL:)  
4.12 TAMOR minutes -- electronic copies
4.13 Budget Presentations Documentation
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATION 5

Recommendation and Analysis

Recommendation 5: 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.

Within this overarching recommendation to develop a sustainable reiterated cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation, the college has identified three specific actions:

- Strengthen information collection, dissemination and use
- Strengthen the alignment between planning and resource allocation by designating a set-aside for enrollment growth initiatives and prioritizing facilities requests
- Update the Educational Master Plan by June 2007 through action by the Academic Senate and its Educational Policies Committee

Progress to Date

Information and data are being made available to those responsible for program review reports and unit planning. (See Rec. 4 for details.) Implementing Recommendation 5 resulted in the following:

- Links strengthened between planning and resource allocation. This includes the prioritizing of enrollment growth initiatives for designated set-aside funding. This process revealed shortcomings in the current program review process.
- Strengthening the connection between planning and resource allocation is evidenced by the prioritizing of facilities requests that came out of unit plans.
- Shared governance made more effective, as defined in MOU #CC906-1.

Strengthening Information Collection & Program Review

The college has, by focusing on Recommendation 4 from 2000, made significant strides in addressing an important part of Recommendation 5, specifically the “strengthening of its information collection…for program review” and to inform decision-making. This is reported on in detail in the preceding report on progress toward Recommendation 4 from 2000.
Two Steps to Link Planning and Budget

In the Fall 2006 semester, West has taken two steps to link planning to budget. First, the college attempted to make a connection between program review and budget allocation processes. Second, the College Planning Committee prioritized facilities requests for funding.

The College Planning Committee had established the criteria for the set-aside designated by the college president to fund enrollment growth initiatives that came out of program reviews and unit plans from 2005-2006 and also from those for 2006-2007. The program review coordinators provided the College Planning Committee with a short list of growth initiatives from last year’s program review reports; however, the list was not helpful. Thus, while the program review reports from 2005-06 were to form the basis for enrollment growth initiatives, in practice, the reports did not adequately provide this level of information. Recognizing this key limitation of the current program review instrument, the college will address this shortcoming in a new online program review instrument to be implemented in July 2007.

As West begins the governance process to implement the online program review instrument, the Program Review Committee and the College Planning Committee will both ensure that the online program review process includes questions that focus on new programs to help grow the college’s enrollment. This attempt to tangibly link planning and resource allocation has thus led to improvements to the current practice.

Another example that links planning to resource allocation are the facilities requests which came out of completed program reviews and unit plans. These requests went through a similar process, i.e., the College Planning Committee formed a work group that established the criteria for prioritizing the requests: safety, student success, enrollment, quality of life and inclusion in the relevant unit plan (5.2 relevant College Planning Committee documents).

Plans for disseminating program review began with adding new members – all of whom are faculty, including two limited math faculty, appointed by the Academic Senate – to both the Program Review Committee and the Comprehensive Program Review Evaluation Committee (5.3 Program Review). This broadening of participation is key to developing a deeper, more well-informed college community, invested in processes to improve student learning. Plans to put program review online for the next cycle are proceeding and will address concerns with redundancy and gaps in the current instrument. The new approach to program review also affords greater transparency and accountability: evaluations of each report will be readily available to governance bodies, policy-setters and decision-makers.

Implementing the College Master Plan

With regard to implementing the college’s Master Plan, in Fall 2007, the college president charged the Academic Senate to direct its Educational Policies Committee to draft an
Educational Master Plan for June 2007. This plan updates the current Educational Master Plan and will provide direction and focus for the next five years.

The president met with the Educational Policies and Standards Committee on January 23, 2007, to provide guiding principles of Student Success and Academic Excellence. His suggestions included asking the following questions: a) How does West’s faculty want to measure success (persistence, transfer, improvement in pre-collegiate courses, workforce education); b) How will the college institutionalize new programs?; c) Regarding full-time faculty hires, which instructional areas would benefit and why? In addition, the committee should consider opportunities and constraints. A timeline for proceeding with this project was agreed upon for Spring 2007 (5.4 Ed. Policies Committee minutes).

Revisiting Shared Governance

Another major undertaking that further indicates how West is dynamically addressing a variety of concerns is the Memorandum of Understanding #CC906-1, dated September 26, 2006, which was formalized in less than three months of collaboration and consultation (5.5 MOU, #CC906-1). It defines the work of effective shared governance as policy formation and development, resulting in recommendations to the president. It further charges the Academic Senate and its Educational Policies and Standards Committee with updating West’s Educational Master Plan by June 2007, kicked off by the Fall Retreat held on November 3, 2006, with its incredible turnout. This timely effort coincides with the District’s newly developed Strategic Planning Initiative and the District’s Student Success Committee actions, along with statewide accountability standards (5.5 Strategic Planning Initiative). It aligns West’s efforts to improve its effectiveness with both the District’s and the state’s. The synergy of state and District accountability and strategic planning goals aligning with West’s revision of its Educational Master Plan provides a dynamic opportunity to take the somewhat functional Master Plan to even an greater level of functionality as the linkages between planning and resource allocation are further strengthened. This multi-level linking process informs West’s many concerted efforts to address Recommendation 5.

Future Plans 2007-08

Over the coming year the college plans to focus its efforts in relation to this recommendation on the following:

- Update West’s Educational Master Plan, taking into account the needs of students preparing for in-demand careers
- Implement an online, user-friendly, data-based, transparent program review instrument that addresses success measures in addition to enrollment growth, further strengthening the link between planning and resource allocation
Documentation for Recommendation 5

5.1  Relevant College Planning Committee agendas and minutes  paper only. Website not up to date  
     http://www.wlac.edu/planning/agendasandminutes.html
5.2  paper only
5.3  Relevant Program Review Committee minutes 
     http://www.wlac.edu/programreview/agendasandminutes.html
5.4. January 23, 2007 Educational Policies and Standards Committee minutes – paper only
5.5  MOU #CC906-1  - paper only
5.6  LACCD Strategic Planning Initiative 
     http://www.wlac.edu/LACCD_Strategic_Plan/index.html
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATION 6

Recommendation and Analysis

**Recommendation 6:** 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.

West Los Angeles College’s efforts to implement this recommendation include the following actions for Fall 2006 semester:

- Periodic review of counseling
- Review of staffing practices
- Review of hours of operation
- Establishment of counseling priorities
  - Increase the number of Student Educational Plans (SEPs) completed.
  - Learning Cohorts - Link Personal Development 5 (College Survival) with Basic Skills English and Math
  - Increase high school outreach

Progress to Date

The periodic review completed in Fall 2006 semester by the Committee for Recommendation 6 culminated with a report to the Accreditation Town Hall meeting of October 31, 2006 (6.1 Power Point). Out of the periodic review, which included the work of the Recommendation 6 Committee and the program review for counseling, came the Counseling Action Plan. This plan includes training for both adjunct and full-time staff in completing Student Educational Plans. Such training will also include helping student services staff better understand how to read data as well as the importance of data collection and analysis. For example, this increased understanding and appreciation for data collection and analysis will enhance counselors’ abilities to plan effectively in determining staffing peaks and demands. In addition, such data will enable counseling to work with Academic Affairs and division chairs in the scheduling of appropriate courses to meet students’ needs.

With regard to its review of staffing practices, the college hired an Associate Dean of Student Services in Spring 2006. In addition, the college filled the vacant Vice President of Student Services position. Filling these positions recognizes the importance of student services as an integral part of the college and further strengthens this vital service to support student success. In addition, counseling secured a commitment to restore equivalent FTEF released faculty counselor plus hire one additional full-time counselor in 2007-08 (6.2 Counseling Staffing).

Reviewing its hours of operation, counseling currently is open from Monday to Thursday from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. and on Fridays from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. During these times, counseling
accommodates walk-ins and individual 30-minute appointments, which can be scheduled online. Because the college is expanding its Week-End College, counseling plans to assess providing services on Saturdays.

Counseling priorities were set through the process of program review as well as through preparing the PowerPoint presentation made on Recommendation 6 at the October 31, 2006, Town Hall Meeting (6.3). The priorities include:

**Increasing the Number of SEPS Completed**

Students with completed Student Educational Plans (SEPs) are better prepared to adequately make decisions regarding their academic plans in order to realize their goals. Counseling completed 2,466 Student Educational Plans last year. The target for 2006-07 and thereafter is to increase this number by 3% (approximately 740 additional SEPs for the current year). Since Personal Development instructors build into their classes the component of completing Student Educational Plans, 3% is a feasible target. With the learning cohorts explained in the next paragraph, the numbers of SEPs completed will also increase.

**Learning Cohorts: Pairing PD5 with Basic Skills English and Math**

Establishing learning cohorts is one proven method to support basic skills students. One collaboration between counseling and academic disciplines involves the linking of a College Survival, Personal Development (PD) 5 class, which is taught by a counselor, with Basic Skills English and Math in order to provide students with a better supportive environment, including tools such as study skills, time management, how to read a textbook and test-taking skills. To increase students’ chances of success, West linked Personal Development 5, College Survival, with English 21, English Fundamentals in Fall 2006. In another pilot, English as a Second Language Grammar and Writing (ESL 6A) was split into three cohorts. One group took Survey of Art History II (Art 102). Another was linked with Personal Development 5. The third group took Learning Skills 073, Online Grammar and Writing Lab. In this ESL 6A class, out of 40 students, 39 were retained. One student transferred to the evening section of ESL 6A.

For Spring 2007 semester, students have additional learning cohort options available to them. Students may choose to take College Reading Skill A (English 20A), English Fundamentals (English 21) or Intermediate Reading and Composition (English 28) linked with a PD 5 class. These options are also available to students who take math, adding two more sections of math courses, Elementary Algebra (Math 115) and Basic Elementary Algebra (Math 117) (6.4 Title V Grant).
Increased High School Outreach
Access to Success is a collaboration among several student services areas reaching out to neighboring service-area high schools.

Matriculation Services at West Los Angeles College designed an “Access to Success” program that provides Matriculation Services to students beyond West’s campus. This program is currently active “off-site” at seven high school locations including Dorsey, Crenshaw, Westchester, Culver City, Los Angeles, Venice and Hamilton High Schools. The program has also been extended to public agencies such as Cedars Sinai Hospital, Crystal Stairs and the Los Angeles Sheriff and Police Departments. Student Ambassadors visit each high school off-site location once a week as well as participate in college fairs at the high school and at the college with college tours and special visits. The Access to Success program offers Admissions, Orientation, Assessment and Counseling, as well as follow-up services to off-site students consistent with the seven key Matriculation Component areas. All students are given written information concerning the college programs and services and become part of an off-site student contact database maintained by Matriculation Services.

Another priority for counseling is a plan to participate in the Student Learning Outcomes workshop in April 2007.

Future Plans
By Fall 2007 we will accomplish the following measurable outcomes as a result of the above counseling priorities:

- Increase number of SEPs.
- Assess the offerings of counseling services on Saturdays.
- Offer basic skills students more basic skills English, ESL and math classes linked to Personal Development 5. Data collection will be an integral part of this effort to document student outcomes through these learning communities.
- Continue and expand high school outreach. This effort also includes a counselor who makes contact with the high school counseling staff and supports college courses taught at the high school campuses.
- Participation by counselors in the Student Learning Outcomes workshop in April is being planned. Counselors will gain a better understanding and insight into how they can best address the institutional learning outcomes through counseling, including communication, critical thinking, self-awareness/interpersonal skills, civic responsibility and ethics.

Documentation for Recommendation 6:

6.1 October 31, 2006, Recommendation 6 Power Point presentation for the Town Hall meeting
http://www.wlac.edu/accreditation/recommendation_committee_minutes/COUNSELING.ppt
6.2 Memo from Vice President of Student Services re. work schedules, assignments
6.3 Counseling Department Action Plan 2006-2007
6.4 Title V Grant – pairing Personal Development 5 with Basic Skills classes
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATION 9

Recommendation and Analysis

Recommendation 9: The College should complete and maintain scheduled employee evaluations.

The college, in its response to Recommendation 9, identified these three action plans for Fall 2007 semester:

- To improve college-wide accountability of evaluations
- To integrate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) into the faculty evaluation process
- To conduct staff development workshops to enhance the evaluation process

Progress to Date

College-wide Accountability of Evaluations

The Committee for Recommendation 9 determined that significant progress in faculty evaluations had been made between the time this recommendation was made and Fall 2006.

The committee reviewed the files of the faculty evaluation process from 2004 through 2006. It found that the Academic Affairs staff had clear and complete records of all faculty to be evaluated in 2006-2007, the number who still need to be evaluated and the number who were in the middle of their process. In addition, Academic Affairs was monitoring and documenting evaluations as they were being completed. The Divisional Council, made up of Academic Affairs staff and the chairs of the instructional, library and counseling divisions, reviewed this process as part of their routine meetings. In the course of this review, it was discovered that not all faculty were notified of upcoming evaluations in accordance with the AFT Agreement; however, this step was corrected as soon as it was noticed.

In consultation with the vice presidents and the president, the committee developed a process with a timeline that monitors and documents evaluations for each vice president and the president to follow, which includes the preparation of an annual college-wide report on evaluations during FLEX day at the beginning of each Fall semester (9.1 Employee Evaluation Planning Chart).

The committee decided to institutionalize evaluations by recommending that the administration document and report on the complete evaluation process annually. This report will identify all staff who were supposed to be evaluated, the number who were evaluated, the number who were not, and the planned steps for completing evaluations for the upcoming year (9.2 Annual Report on College-wide Evaluations).
The Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Student Services and Administrative Services identified the following number of evaluations as of February 12, 2007, conducted in 2006-2007:

Academic Affairs
  Full-time 36
  (Total full-time faculty: 110)
  Adjunct 157
  (Total adjunct in Spring and Fall 2006: 324 and 302)
Total faculty evaluations completed in 2006-2007 193

Faculty evaluations to be completed by May 30, 2007 67

Please note that faculty evaluations are conducted according to the contract in effect. All tenured faculty members are evaluated every three years as noted in Article 19 of the 2005-2008 AFT Agreement. Thus, the number of full-time faculty evaluated listed above reflects about one-third of all full-time faculty. All temporary faculty, including limited, substitute status or adjunct faculty are to be evaluated in their first two semesters of employment and thereafter every six semesters as noted in Article 19, page 68, of the 2005-2008 AFT Agreement.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs at monthly Divisional Council meetings and the Vice President of Student Services at Student Services meetings review the status of evaluations and send letters to chairs to remind them of evaluations due by the end of the semester. Further, Academic Affairs is revising the status report so it can more easily provide reports in different ways on the status of evaluations so counts and totals are available without extra effort.

The Vice President of Administrative Services reported for 2006-2007
  Administration evaluations completed 6
  Administration evaluations to be completed by May 30, 2007 0

Total West LA College classified evaluations completed in 2006-07 122
  (Total West LA College classified employees: 146)
  Classified evaluations to be completed by May 30, 2007 to be determined by birthday month, according to the contract

Integrating the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) into the Faculty Evaluation Process

The committee obtained the Los Angeles Community College District’s (LACCD) framework for integrating Student Learning Outcomes into the evaluation process for faculty and requested that the local President of the American Federation of
Teachers (AFT) faculty unit and the College’s Academic Senate President add SLOs to the evaluation process (9.3 LACCD SLO Framework).

The Academic Senate and the AFT Faculty Chapter presidents reported February 1, 2007, that they have agreed to establish a joint Senate and AFT faculty committee by Fall 2007 to develop a recommendation for the inclusion of SLOs in faculty evaluations within the existing provisions of the Agreement.

Staff Development Workshops to Enhance the Evaluation Process

- The committee developed and scheduled two training sessions for Spring 2007 that will assist the college in completing faculty evaluations that assess and improve faculty performance, including timely feedback to faculty regarding job performance to ensure quality teaching and expected Student Learning Outcomes.

The committee has identified two workshops to be held in Spring 2007. First, Staff Development will host a workshop with support from the LACCD on the process and purpose of evaluation for all faculty and staff. The purpose of this workshop is to develop awareness of evaluations, their importance and value; to review the procedures, employees’ rights, and contractual language in each agreement about evaluations; to hold an opportunity for questions and answers. Second, Staff Development will host a workshop on how the SLOs can be integrated into faculty evaluations to ensure teaching quality and to link evaluation of the quality of teaching with Student Learning Outcomes.

Effectiveness of the Actions Taken by the Committee

The committee went well beyond the recommendation by looking at all employees’ evaluations, levels of completion, procedures, documentation and need for staff development. It also consulted with the LACCD to identify points in time when decentralization and reorganization failed to include complete communication and support in shifting the responsibility for evaluation of employees from the LACCD to the college.

In the course of the committee’s meetings and consultations with responsible administrators and faculty leaders, procedures were improved, but it also became clear that a great deal of progress had been made already and that classified staff and faculty evaluations were being completed and documented.

The committee has ensured that an annual review of all evaluations of faculty and staff will be made. It has initiated staff development training sessions to enhance the evaluation process.

The vice presidents and the college president have elevated the awareness of the importance and value of evaluation in their regularly scheduled meetings, and the entire college community has a greater awareness of evaluation.
Future Plans

- Report annual college-wide evaluations’ results on FLEX Day
- Integrate Student Learning Outcomes into the Faculty Evaluation Process
- Plan Staff Development workshops to enhance evaluations

Documentation for Recommendation 9:

9.1 Employee Evaluation Planning Chart
9.2 Annual Report on College-wide Employee Evaluations
9.3 LACCD SLO Framework
APPENDIX

Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges: College Performance Indicators

West Los Angeles College’s efforts to meet its mission of helping our students succeed includes analysis of data. Part of that data includes the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>WLAC’s Rate</th>
<th>Peer Group Average</th>
<th>Peer Group Low</th>
<th>Peer Group High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress and Achievement Rate</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence Rate</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges: College Performance Indicators Compared to College Peer Groupings. From California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges: Draft Report (January 2007).
Notes from the Town Hall Meetings

To inform the college community of work being done to address the overarching recommendations, the Recommendations’ Committees Chairs and Co-Chairs, with the college president, held two Town Hall Meetings on the draft progress report. Here are the notes for these meetings, which were emailed to the college community.

TOWN HALL MEETING on the draft PROGRESS REPORT
Hearing Moments/Conversation
October 31, 2006
4th floor HLRC
Notes by Fran Leonard, Faculty Chair pro tem

Fifty-seven participants signed in for this event held on the 4th floor of the HLRC. Dr. Rocha’s opening comments welcomed everyone and asked for their input to the Progress Report. The college president commended the faculty chair and co-chairs for the tremendous work that has been accomplished and asked everyone to continue to work on recommendations coming out of the evaluation of West’s self study.

Reports followed by the chairs and co-chairs of the Recommendations’ Committees. These included:
for Recommendation 1 and 13 on civility, trust and respect and increased participation in governance, Olga Shewfelt; for Recommendation 4 from 2000 and 5 on planning and a culture of evidence, Fran Leonard; Recommendation 6 on counseling and acceptable levels of staffing, Sherron Rouzan and Yvonne Simone; and for Recommendation 9 on employee evaluations, Rod Patterson and Bob Sprague.

Some of the ideas mentioned:

The need for shorter meetings with clear outcomes
Accountability for faculty members

Regarding counseling – faculty consider inviting a counselor to speak to their classes. Faculty encourage students to make an appointment with a counselor. Two faculty stated that they give extra credit to students who do a Student Education Plan (SEP). Update counselors on voc ed programs; need to update brochures (program, course sequence, etc.). Faculty consider attending counselors’ meetings on Wednesday of each week to inform counselors of curricula changes, early alert, etc. Another faculty member asked, “What is considered a complete SEP? It should cover the student’s career here.” SEPs should be “advertised” in financial aid. Another faculty member observed, “With 4000 students undeclared, what level of counseling staffing is needed to reduce this number?”

One observation regarding basic skills – students are taking too many classes at inappropriate levels which sets students up for academic failure.
Recom. 9 – Evaluations. How to integrate SLOs in evaluations? Recommend that a joint committee of the AFT Guild and Senate look at this for a possible MOU. SLOs should be part of faculty’s class syllabi.

A chair asked about “truthful” evaluations. This chair questioned that an evaluation that was negative would be sustained by the administration through the process. How does evaluation really work? How will SLOs get folded into the evaluation process? Need for staff development. Recommendation is an opportunity to improve what now takes place often in isolation. Another chair observes that the current peer evaluation is an “incestuous” relationship. According to another chair and former grievance rep, follow the contract, follow timelines.
Town Hall Meeting on the Draft Progress Report  
Thursday, December 7, 2006  
1 pm -2:30 pm  
FA-103  
Notes by Fran Leonard, Faculty Chair pro tem

Attending (signed in): Ara Aguiar, Chuck Amaugo, Patricia Banday, Eloise Crippens,  
Isabella Chung, Abe Farkas, Barbara Friedman, Vikki Grounds, Betty Jacobs, Fran Leonard,  
Maria Luisa Mateo, Christina Misner, John Oester, Rod Patterson, Abel Rodriguez, Yvonne  
Simone, Paul Stansbury, Buck Stapleton, Lloyd Thomas and Pat Siever

Introduction

Fran Leonard welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending this Town Hall meeting  
on the draft Progress Report. She said that the draft report came out of the self-study visit last March and that West’s accreditation has been affirmed until 2012. The document attesting to this is framed and hangs outside the door to the president’s office.

The visiting team acknowledged the energy and momentum that produced the self-study report, but wondered whether the college could and would maintain this momentum, and as a result of the evaluation by the Commission, West must submit a progress report to the Commission by March 15, 2007, addressing six recommendations. This will be followed by a visit by two former team members.

Another progress report is due March 15, 2008, again followed by a visit.

And then, a midterm report in March 2009.

The draft report is the result of a widely-consulted and agreed-upon process, started in July 2006 and finalized in the agreement that came out of the August 17, 2006, meeting. This agreement specified the forming of four recommendations’ committees with chairs, co-chairs and vice-chairs pro tem. Dr. Rocha charged these committees to identify actions to be taken during “90 days of progress,” which address the specific recommendations. The draft progress report captures these actions, describing them and evaluating how they respond to the recommendations. Documentation and evidence supporting the claims are also part of the report.

Reading and understanding the report requires an understanding of the recommendations and what they specify the college must address.

Samples of written input – all by email to the faculty chair – have been shared with Recommendation Committee chairs and at the Divisional Council mtg. of Dec. 5, 2006, and also by email with the Senate.
By reading and discussing the report, we hope that the college community will be duly informed and better able to talk about specifics relating to the recommendations when the team visits in Spring 2007.

The Academic Senate meeting of Tuesday, December 12, will feature discussion and action on the draft Progress Report. Because the report will need to be edited and then produced in preparation for presentation to the Board of Trustees (by February 6, 2007), all input must be submitted by the first week of January.

**Recommendations 1 and 13**

Eloise read recommendations 1 and 13 and mentioned the members of this committee as well as the work undertaken by this committee to address “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” and expanding participation in governance.

Clyde noted that there must be room for and consideration of dissent. He also said that some faculty do not wish to present their dissenting views in a public venue. Betty said that dissent is valuable when it is based on specifics rather than generalities. Abe added that dissent, to be taken seriously, should not just consist of saying, “I disagree with the majority” for the sake of disagreeing or “ambushing” the process when the team visits. Dissenters are “still part of the community.” The Code of Ethics, coming out of the Leadership Retreat of November 3, 2006, is further evidence to support Recommendation 1. Eloise mentioned that the Recomm. 1 and 13 committee had received input specifically about an “old grievance,” and that sometimes, not everyone is aware of what progress has been made. Minority opinions can have value. Rod Patterson mentioned the Distance Learning Committee meeting yesterday which has finally happened, despite past governance issues that once stymied this effort. In addition, he talked about how he mentions in his political science classes, the way the Supreme Court categorizes decisions – majority, concurring and dissenting, a lesson for us of the value of considering multiple voices, viewpoints on issues.

**Recommendations 4 and 5**

Fran Leonard, chair of this committee, reported that the need to “develop and evaluate strategies to ensure the communication, use and integration of existing and planned research and evaluation throughout the college” is best shown through the introduction of a data packet in this year’s cycle of program review.

Many division chairs and other units responsible for program review met individually with the college researcher to go over their specific data. A sample of this type of documentation was provided to attendees.

Members of this committee surveyed academic division chairs in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the program review process and of the data provided. A range of responses
was recorded, leading the Program Review Committee to look at an online program review process that will make the process more user-friendly and include data in graphical form. Data is also being shared at meetings such as the AFT Faculty Guild, informing many, for example, of the impressive 87% completion rate for West’s vocational programs, something to be emulated by other programs and touted in our marketing and publicity.

Input provided included that from John Oester about the budget presentations made at the College Council, the College Planning Committee and the Budget Committee to “demystify” the budget and provide more transparency. This will be incorporated into the draft progress report.

Lloyd asked about the documentation for the $125,000 set-aside for enrollment growth initiatives, and Marie asked that the value of the budget presentations be included as well.

**Recommendation 6**

Co-chair Yvonne Simone spoke about the process and the identified actions to address counseling concerns. Actions include the training of adjunct faculty in how to complete Student Education Plans (SEPs) and being more organized as a department. Understaffing continues to be cited as a challenge. Eloise asked whether specific plans are being made. Paul Stansbury mentioned that he had just met with Sherron, the chair of counseling, and they spoke about reviewing other small colleges and their “best practices.” Rod asked whether counseling has prioritized for action the recommendations that came out of the Comprehensive Program Review Evaluation of two years ago. Marie noted that the report contains a lot of excerpts of surveys; however, she noted that there is no mention of what has been done/developed and what they (counseling) plan to achieve from those actions/plans. Include a timeline.

**Recommendation 9**

Co-chair Rod Patterson described the research and work of this committee, reading the specific contract language that covers all employees of the college. To further a system of accountability and reporting on progress toward getting evaluations done, the committee will look at what format works best and when the reporting should occur since the next Flex Day won’t be until August 2007. Bob Sprague, co-chair, attended a Staff Development meeting to see how staff development might actively help in ensuring better, more meaningful evaluations. Paul answered Eloise regarding progress in evaluations of faculty and John Oester mentioned the intention to have all staff evaluated by the time the team arrives. Paul also noted that reporting mechanisms should be standardized and institutionalized as part of program review.

**Conclusion**

Those attending were asked to share the discussions and information with their colleagues and to attend the upcoming Senate meeting on Tuesday.
PROGRESS REPORT PARTICIPATION AND INPUT JOURNAL

This journal is part of West Los Angeles College’s efforts to elicit, capture and document email feedback from the college community on the Progress Report through its development.

Feedback on the Draft Progress Report

From: Sprague, Robert S.
Sent: Monday, December 4, 2006 8:23 AM
To: Leonard, Frances T.
Subject: Re: re. draft report on Recom 4/2000 & 5

Fran,

Thanks. Yes, I read the update. I learned a lot from you when we talked about this. I learned things about the complexity of the issue and some of the facts around the issue. I think the report is fair and reasonable. Bob

From: Morrison, Phyllis
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2006 3:26 PM
To: Leonard, Frances T.
Subject: accreditation progress draft report

Before the Thanksgiving holiday, I read the entire draft accreditation progress report and the cover memo which defined the input parameters. At today’s senate meeting you also mentioned that the committee would appreciate comments on accuracy. I have a couple of observations.

1. In the section on recommendations 1 & 13, there is a statement about an MOU on shared governance approved by the College Council in October 2006 (line 19). I may be out-of-the-loop on this issue, but I am unaware of such an MOU. At its September 25, 2006 meeting, the College Council approved an MOU titled “Memorandum of Understanding #CC906-1 Concerning Effective College Governance Process”.

2. In the section on recommendation 9, there is a discussion about the development of a memo to initiate the faculty evaluation process (lines 540-551). Since the preparation of this draft, actions have been taken. Today I received copies of written notices addressed to Science Division adjunct faculty informing them that they are scheduled for evaluation this academic year. The memos are dated November 15, 2006.

From: Morrison, Phyllis
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2006 5:41 PM
To: Leonard, Frances T.
Subject: draft progress report

Fran,
I have read the draft progress report. The sections for recommendations 4 and 5 are especially good in capturing what actions have been taken to bring the college closer to those standards.
Phyllis

From: Levy, Murray
To: Shewfelt, Olga; Crippens, Eloise
Cc: Leonard, Frances T.
Subject: Comments-thoughts, recommendations 1 & 13

I would like to see some words in response to recommendation 13 along the lines of:

“The college recognizes that some faculty members choose to devote their non-teaching time to developing and implementing new classes and entirely new programs. These contributions are as important as participation in shared governance committees and faculty members who improve the college in this way are honored and respected along with their colleagues who are involved in shared governance committees.”

I’m thinking specifically of my colleague, Marcus Butler, who personally implemented over 10 new classes and introduced two completely new and important vocational programs that have attracted hundreds of students to West.

From: Taylor, Alice
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2006 8:25 AM
To: Leonard, Frances T.
Subject: Draft Report Comments

Dear Fran,
On the whole, I think the draft is in very good shape—thoughtful, concise, and on point. I have a few suggestions, which I’ll list by Recommendation:

#1: (line 27): state the 11 proposals and indicate any that have moved beyond the proposal status to become policy or actions.

#13 (line 60): give some examples of recruiting new and effective participants. Perhaps cite the number of people serving on committees who have not served before, what our brand-new faculty have taken on, people who have become committee chairs for the first time.
#13 should also include the last Leadership Retreat.
#4 and #5: state where the Data Book is available to the community. If it can't be placed online, it should be in the library and various offices named in the report.

#4 and #5: I think the college needs to identify some Key Performance Indicators—measures we agree are significant, and which the Office of Institutional Research can track using agreed-upon data.

#6: It's not clear whether we are doing an adequate number of SEPs and just need to document that fact, or whether we need to increase the number we are doing. (line 423) "Individual student needs" is too vague. What constitutes an SEP should be clearly defined.

#9: Accountability should extend beyond reporting our situation. Those responsible for doing evaluations should themselves be formally evaluated on how well they are keeping up.

We all owe you and your committees many thanks for the hard work that has gone into creating this report!

Sincerely,
Alice

From: Leonard, Frances T.
Sent: Tue 11/27/2006 1:54 pm
To: Shewfelt, Olga
Re: Recoms 1 and 13

As I read through the draft report again, Olga, I also saw the following for your consideration:

Recommendation 1 - line 30 (on the website) "increase accountability" How?

Recom. 13 - line 55 "Each and every one of these proposals has an identified part and a timeline for its execution." [Be sure that you have details and examples to add for evidence and documentation to support this claim.]

Recom 13 - line 60 "...the college has been fostering the establishment of a new set of information networks that would facilitate the implementation of these proposals." [Again, give a few specific, detailed examples that SHOW this.]

And - two typos:
Line 12 "have been two-folded" should be "have been two-fold" Line 15 "appropriated" should be "appropriate."

-----Original Message-----
From: Leonard, Frances T.
Thank you, Olga, for working on this report and updating it. I can also see the improvement made by re-organizing the text as you did.

I'm glad that you mentioned the Fall Leadership Retreat; however, there is no mention of what happened at that retreat or the previous one - and details are not only helpful but necessary. Remember that we are addressing folks who don't know these details, so it's incumbent on us to provide the details. The important thing to mention about the Spring 2006 retreat was the emphasis on teamwork and describing the tasks given us by our facilitator Kikanzaa to work out in groups in a specified time period. Of course, some commented on the fact that the tasks should have been more closely related to what we actually encounter on a daily basis; however, it was a good exercise in seeing how different people worked together well or not.

The Fall Leadership Retreat needs to be fleshed out more as well. It's a good idea to go back to the day's agenda. I recall not only the camaraderie among the different working groups (as with the spring retreat) but also the work on college ethics. Please ask Pat to provide you with more details.

With regard to the action plan for "embracing a culture of mutual respect," I recommend that that description be expanded beyond following the good example set by Dr. Rocha. One example I can cite because it just happened was the most recent Town Hall - Dec. 7, 2006 - on the draft progress report, the notes for which I've attached here for you to refer to. The discussion - very respectful - and Eloise can attest to this - was raised by Clyde Titus about how to deal with dissenting viewpoints. This important discussion should be an example of how the trust and open, candid dialogue is taking place with or without the president present.

Also, for Recommendation #1 2) - the mention of the Open Hour on Friday. Wasn't that changed as well to another day and time? Please check with Marie on this and update as needed.

For Recommendation #1 3) - "The college needs to conduct regular evaluations of all its employees, please refer to the report for Recommendation #9 which addresses this in some detail. I am sure that Rod and Bob can help you with this. There should be consistency in the report, i.e., that we know what is going on with other related recommendations - an example of Recommendation #1, which talks about a campus climate of "open, candid dialogue...to improve institutional decision making, planning and effectiveness."

With regard to "improving communications," I would include mention of the most recent issue of the student newsletter, which came out of the College Council meeting, led by Dr. Rocha that centered a lot on a college newspaper (mentioned first by Gerald Ludwig). The
most recent issue is error-free, with a variety of informative articles to appeal to a wider readership.

With regard to chairs holding regular meetings - to follow up on this. Did your committee look into how many division meetings were held in the fall semester? Perhaps this is a good time to do this - again for some "real" evidence to support the claim for improvement. Accountability, again, is linked to other things such as the number of course outlines updated (and this can be verified with Lloyd Thomas - and shows improvement over time) as well as the plan to report out the percentages of improvement in completing staff, administration and faculty evaluations (please check with Bob and Rod on this).

To follow up on the sentence, "Responsible parties for each proposal have been identified and timelines are being developed," it's a good idea to include this information in the report as well, as you are most likely planning to do.

I recall seeing the notes from Alice Taylor on Recom 13 which speak to the appointment of Nikki Jacobson to the College Planning Committee as an example of how the interim college president went beyond the usual candidates to bring someone new into the governance process. I put a copy of her notes/input in your mailbox.

That's it for now.
Thanks again.
Regards,
Fran

From: Titus, Clyde

Sent: Thu 12/14/2006  6:38 PM

To: Leonard, Frances

This is my follow up to our discussion about “dissenting” voices in the accreditation process.

1. Any evaluation of a complex situation that does not take into consideration as many contributions as reasonably possible, is not as accurate an evaluation as it could be, in my judgment. In line with this view, I placed a copy of an article from today’s L. A. Times concerning the very elaborate “Millennium Challenge 02”, and, the makeup of the Iraq Study Group. In both cases, the activity was skewed to suit the desired outcome. Please see author Tom Engelhardt’s final paragraph. My belief is that a serious evaluation effort should be conducted along scientific inquiry lines, in that you accept the outcome and make your corrections on that basis.

2. Many employees, I believe, are not keen on discussing issues the way we do in college committees. Nowhere else are things discussed endlessly as we do. For
those that want to do that discussing, this is a great environment. However, the others, who are more narrowly focused on the job they are basically assigned to do (teach or whatever), may have just as valuable or accurate views on the college. For them, they may be very reluctant to speak publicly or spend the time defending their views.

Therefore I like the idea of the Accreditation Committee identifying and announcing an ombudsperson type of arrangement whereby any individual may submit their opinions orally or in writing without necessarily being identified. The committee might then make their judgment on the merits of the opinion and any supporting evidence. The committee might very well reasonably conclude that it was a view coming from a disgruntled employee out to do unwarranted damage. But, the view should be able to be aired.

Thank you for your willingness to hear my view.