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Statement on Report Preparation

A. Process and Timeline

As per its charge, the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) oversees and manages all accreditation and ACCJC-related matters including internal and external reporting on current accreditation status for Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC). The ASC is a shared governance committee that meets biweekly, with additional meetings called as needed. ASC consists of the following members:

- **Administration**
  - Four VPs: Ramon Castillo, Mary Gallagher, Marcy Drummond, and Deborah Harrington (Accreditation Liaison Officer)

- **Academic Senate**
  - AS President or designee: Lourdes Brent
  - Faculty Accreditation Chair: Joseph Ratcliff

- **AFT Faculty**
  - Carole Anderson

- **Other Faculty**
  - Chair of Chairs or designee: Alicia Rodriguez-Estrada

- **AFT Staff**
  - Shirley Chen

- **ASO**
  - President or designee: Lisa Munoz

- **Resources**
  - Anna Badalyan (Dean, Institutional Effectiveness), Marilyn Maine (Faculty Chair, Program Review), SLO Coordinator (was Tom Vessella), and David Ysais (Public Relations Manager)

On July 12, 2010, the ASC moved to approve that an overview of LATTC’s responses to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Letter of Action from June 30, 2010 be presented to the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees (RP.1). This overview was presented to the District Board by the President’s designee, the Academic Senate President, and the Faculty Accreditation Chair on July 14, 2010 (RP.2).

By mid-August, the ASC had organized taskforces to collect, review, and organize evidence and then to prepare draft responses to each of the ACCJC recommendations in the Follow Up Report (FUR). The following individuals from the ASC were organized to lead the taskforces: The Vice President of Administrative Services, who also co-chairs the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), headed two of the taskforces, the ones for recommendations two and four. The Vice President of Student Services and Academic Senate President headed the response for recommendation five, and the Faculty Accreditation Chair (FAC) and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness led the response for recommendation three.

At the College Council Retreat on August 19, 2010, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), FAC, and Academic Senate President summarized how each recommendation would be responded to and described the main College Council committees to which regular reports on the FUR’s progress would be given, i.e. Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), Program Review Committee (PRC), and ASC (RP.3). Accreditation updates were given at all the regular meetings of these committees in addition to the Academic Senate and Academic Council throughout the Fall and Winter Semesters (RP.4).
At convocation on August 26, 2010, an update was given to all faculty on the FUR with particular emphasis given to the process and timelines for completing Program Review cycles at the department and divisional levels along with student learning outcome (SLO) and Assessments at the Department level; attention was also paid to the validation processes that would be used to record dialogue and progress for each (RP.5). During the bimonthly meetings of the ASC, updates on the work of each taskforce were presented for feedback and direction by the entire group (RP.6).

A midpoint update on progress on the completion of the FUR was presented by the ALO, FAC, and Academic Senate President to the LACCD Board of Trustees’ Student Success and Planning Committee on December 1, 2010 (RP.7). This subcommittee of the BOT includes the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness, and the District Academic Senate President (RP.8).

January 31-February 17, 2011, the ASC gave its final feedback to each of the completed responses to recommendations drafted by the taskforces. The entire campus community had a final opportunity to provide input into the draft of the FUR February 17–February 27, 2011 when it was posted online. On February 23, 2011, the Academic Senate gave its approval of the FUR (RP.9), with College Council providing the same on February 28, 2011 (RP.10). The College President sent the FUR forward for approval by the BOT, where it was approved on March 9, 2011 (RP.11).

B. Document Format

The report follows the format prescribed by ACCJC. In addition to a cover sheet, table of contents and a statement of report preparation signed by the college’s Chief Executive Officer, the following information is provided. Each recommendation identified by the Commission in its action letter dated June 30, 2010 appears in the report. For each recommendation the report includes the following: a) a description of the resolution of each recommendation, b) an analysis of the results achieved to date, c) any additional plans the institution has developed to further respond to the recommendation, and d) evidence of the results.

All supporting evidence is listed at the end of each section responding to the recommendation. The convention used to reference all evidence is as follows. Each exhibit of evidence is identified by a Roman numeral that corresponds to the number of the recommendation provided by the Commission, and an Arabic number is used to identify the number of the exhibit. For example, the first exhibit of evidence for Recommendation Three on student learning outcomes (SLOs) is identified as III.1. Evidence used in support of the process the college engaged to develop, review, and approve the follow-up report begins with the letters “RP” to designate Report Preparation.

Roland “Chip” Chapdelaine
President, Los Angeles Trade Technical College

Date
Introduction

This report responds to the June 30, 2010 letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the findings of the Evaluation Report resulting from the site visit that occurred on April 19, 2010 at Los Angeles Trade Technical College (LATTC). Evidence is provided that demonstrates how, for each of the four recommendations, LATTC has continued to do the “considerable good work” noted in the Evaluation Report of the last site visit and has achieved resolution by completely implementing integrated practices and assessing their effectiveness. These results were achieved using the procedures that were put in place prior to the team’s last visit, and campus wide dialogue and participation continued as LATTC worked towards the completion of the recommendations. The planning process used for 2010-11 was evaluated by the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) and three task forces were formed to review specific areas for improvement: 1) budget allocation formula, 2) annual unit planning, and 3) prioritization of resource requests. In addition the campus was surveyed in fall 2010 on the effectiveness of planning at the campus. Recommendations from the task forces and the surveys were incorporated into the planning for 2011-12. In addition, results from the prioritization of resource requests from the Program Review Update (PRU) completed in 2009 and the allocation of funds based on these updates indicate the college has successfully completed the planning cycle. Changes made to the program review process based upon the feedback and evaluation from these PRUs are evident in the more recent modular approach the college has adopted. Completed prioritization of these modular comprehensive program reviews, annual program reviews, and annual unit plans show the college continues to use the processes put in place to improve campus planning. The report also includes evidence on the college’s continued work on student learning outcomes (SLOs) and service area outcomes (SAOs), showing that procedures put forth in its Assessment Management Plan (AMP) have produced course assessments in line with the goals for 2012 set forth by the ACCJC; further, the use of the assessment results of these student learning outcomes (SLOs) and service area outcomes (SAOs) will be the basis for determining the effectiveness of the college’s offerings/services and a means to make additional resource requests.

The report provides the current status of our administration which has solidified over the last five years. In addition, the report includes data on administrative turnover at the college and the plans that are being put into place to train future leaders of the campus in order to make future transitions easier.

Finally, the report addresses the procedures developed to improve communication between the campus and the district, especially between related committees, and how this work has led to improved websites to help disseminate information, define the flow of communication, and provide a clearer definition of those members who will report out on information.
EVIDENCE

RP.1 Accreditation Steering Committee July 12, 2010 Meeting Minutes

RP.2 Board of Trustees Planning and Student Success Committee July 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes

RP.3 College Council August 19, 2010 Retreat Summary

RP.4 Program Review Committee December 7, 2010 Meeting Minutes
   Academic Council December 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes
   Academic Council December 7, 2010 Meeting Minutes
   Academic Senate October 12, 2010 Meeting Minutes
   Program Review Committee October 5, 2010 Meeting Minutes

RP.5 August 26, 2010 Convocation Day Agenda

RP.6 Accreditation Steering Committee October 11, 2010 Meeting Minutes
   Accreditation Steering Committee November 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes
   Accreditation Steering Committee December 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes

RP.7 Board of Trustees Planning and Student Success Committee December 1, 2010 Meeting Minutes

RP.8 Board of Trustees Planning and Student Success Committee December 1, 2010 Meeting Minutes

RP.9 Academic Senate February 23, 2011 Draft Meeting Minutes

RP.10 College Council February 28, 2011 Draft Meeting Minutes

RP.11 Board of Trustees Planning Committee of the Whole March 9, 2011 Draft Meeting Minutes
College Recommendation 2-Theme: Evaluation, Planning & Improvement

The Commission notes the considerable good work done by Los Angeles Trade Technical College to address recommendations and come into compliance with standards. Much of the work is done, and what remains is simply a full opportunity to implement new practices and assess their effectiveness. The Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2011 should demonstrate the institution’s final resolution of the recommendations below:

As cited in previous accreditation recommendations (1997 and 2003), the team recommends that in order to meet the standards, the college develop and fully implement an integrated planning process that clearly links program review, all aspects of human, physical, technology and fiscal planning, and resource allocation in a cohesive and inclusive manner. Development of the model should be based on prevailing best practices that include a clearly established and calendared cycle, use of current and relevant internal and external environmental data, analysis of data to inform planning, a committee review process, linkage to resource allocation, and evaluation of the implemented plan. (Std. I.B; I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.4; T.B.5; I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.2, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C, II.C.2, III.D, III.D.3.)

Findings of the 2010 Evaluation Report:

The Commission noted that substantial work had been done by Los Angeles Trade Technical College (LATTC) to address Recommendation #2 and that, in fact, the college did all that was possible in the time frame to demonstrate its commitment to fully meeting the recommendation.

The team stated that tremendous progress had been made by the college in the form of implementing an integrated cycle of program review, planning, resource allocation, and evaluation in a somewhat limited period of time since the 2009 team visit, but that this shortened period did not allow the college to demonstrate the completion of the cycle, stating “that resources were allocated, but the results of the plans and funding decisions were not known.” Furthermore, the team stated that, although the college was on the right track, it had not yet met the standard of continuous improvement. They indicated that with the use of data from program reviews along with the development and use of the SLO findings, the college would experience a significant improvement in its overall practice.

The following pages will specify how LATTC has fully resolved this recommendation through its integrated Planning and Program Review, a college-wide process which recursively plans, acts, assesses, evaluates, and uses results to improve institutional effectiveness.
Introduction:

At the time of the 2010 Visit, LATTC had developed an integrated planning process linking program review, all aspects of human, physical, technology and fiscal planning, and resource allocation in a cohesive and inclusive manner. The diagram below illustrates the complete process:
In this integrated planning and program review process, data from different sources informs the program review. The soft data is the information collected through sources such as surveys, previous year program review validations, and advisory recommendations. The hard data is the information obtained from internal and external reports such as institutional effectiveness indicators, ARCC indicators, job market demand, and industry trends. Assessment results include the information obtained based on assessment findings and analysis of student learning outcomes (SLOs), program learning outcomes (PLOs), service area outcomes (SAOs), and the college core competencies. All this data is reviewed, discussed, and analyzed in the program review process. Based on these analyses, the program goals are developed which are part of the Annual Unit Plan (AUP). The AUP section also highlights the connection of program goals and outcomes (SLO, PLO, and SAO) as well as questions discussed in the program review document. In addition, AUP links area goals to the institutional goals. Area goals are further defined within the AUP by establishing objectives, activities, and budgetary requests that will be needed to accomplish these goals. The entire program review including AUP moves from unit/discipline to department then to division. The budgetary requests go through the prioritization process then to implementation; non budgetary requests go directly into implementation. The results of implementation feed into the next year’s program review, and the cycle continues.

Additionally, the modules of the comprehensive program review serve as the basis to inform the review of institutional plans as they become due for evaluation and update. On completion of program review modules, pertinent information is transmitted for use by the committees responsible for evaluating and updating the scheduled institutional plans according to the planning calendar (II.1). The modular approach allows all areas to provide input and recommendations for change.

**Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation:**

**Program Review Update 2009-2010**

The Program Review Update (PRU) was developed and approved for the 2009-2010 academic year to integrate program goal setting with the goals of the Strategic Master Plan 2008-2012. It also introduced how learning outcomes would be used to link program resource requests with the college budget process. The PRU allowed the process to proceed and ensured broad-based involvement of all college personnel. The PRU was designed as a one-time process with the intention of enhancing it to a fully integrated comprehensive program review, annual program review, and annual unit planning.

The process and framework of the PRU was created with campus involvement. Additionally, the PRU was used as the tool to bring the entire college community to a common understanding of the integration of program review and planning. It also allowed the campus to demonstrate the increased involvement, knowledge, and understanding of the entire process. The campus involvement is indicated by the 100% completion (132 PRU documents) of these updates by every campus unit, discipline, and department (II.2). The PRU process provided the groundwork for the development and implementation of the college’s current program review process.
During the Program Review Update 2009-2010, the campus was introduced to a pilot validation process. PRUs were validated for the first time at the discipline and department level using a simple form (II.3). This pilot validation process allowed the Program Review Committee (PRC) to evaluate the process used in 2009-10 as well as provide additional feedback in the form of commendations and recommendations in preparation for the program reviews of 2010-11.

**Prioritization 2009-2010**

All 2009-10 discipline/unit Annual Unit Plans that contained monetary resource requests were prioritized. The department then compiled these unit prioritized resource requests and they were developed into one list of department prioritized resource requests. The division received these department lists of resource requests in priority order and compiled a list of division prioritized resource requests. Of particular note, the process for prioritizing resource requests requires that the rankings from the unit to the department to the division to the institution remain unchanged. For example, no area’s number two request could be placed before that area’s number one request when prioritized at the next level. The five division (office of the president, academic affairs, workforce and economic development, student services, and administrative services) lists of non-permanent employee resource requests were forwarded to the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) for a finalized list of institution-wide resource requests in priority order. The PBC sent the list out campus-wide for input for two weeks. The PBC then sent the final approved list to College Council for approval. The Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (FHPC) of the Academic Senate completed a list of rankings for new faculty hire requests derived from the PRU. The FHPC list and College Council approved list were forwarded to the president for approval (II.4).

This completed prioritization cycle led to nine department requests being funded from the list for an overall amount of $296,405. In addition, this prioritized resource request list was used to fund some of the Perkins plan for 2010-11; as an example, the results of this prioritization helped the Culinary Department fund the preparation for their specialized accreditation visit (II.5).

At the completion of the cycle for the PRU, a survey was distributed to the campus that included the prioritization process and the campus’ understanding of that process (II.6) Analysis of this survey and its results were discussed by the Prioritization of Resource Request Taskforce of the PBC (II.7)

Additionally, in the spring of 2010, the PBC reviewed the processes used to integrate planning that were performed in its 2009-10 program review update and annual planning to determine the improvements needed for the process (II.8). The result of these discussions led the PBC to form three task forces to work through the summer of 2010 to recommend improvements.

1. AUP Taskforce
The first PBC group was tasked with developing an Annual Unit Plan (AUP) that linked with the Annual Program Review (APR) and included the means for resource requests. This taskforce was convened by the college’s Dean of Institutional Effectiveness on June 9, 2010 and worked directly with the Program Review Committee (PRC), the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), and the District Institutional Effectiveness System Development Team. This collaboration was vital as input from all these committees was important to the overall success of the synchronized processes and documents that were used (II.9). The final document of the AUP was reported to PRC on August 13, 2010, approved by the PBC on August 16, 2010, and adopted by the Academic Senate on September 14, 2010.

2. Prioritization of Resource Requests Taskforce (II.10)

As the PBC had worked to develop a consolidated list of prioritized resource requests from all the divisions from the PRU in the winter of 2010, they experienced a great deal of difficulty determining the priority order. As the committee went through this difficult process, they gathered a list of “parking lot” items to be discussed in the future for resolution before another round of these activities occurred in the upcoming planning cycle. After multiple special PBC meetings took place in early spring 2010, it was apparent that work needed to occur to better understand and develop a method of how to take all of the prioritized resource requests from the divisions and arrive at an integrated list that PBC could recommend to College Council.

This second summer task force was convened by the Vice President of Workforce and Economic Development with the goal of reviewing the “parking lot” items from the PRU prioritization process and revising the method used to complete the comprehensive list of prioritized requests for the 2010-11 program review. The task force worked diligently through the summer of 2010 and reported to the PBC on August 16, 2010 (II.11). However, the PBC was not satisfied with the outcome of the taskforce and the number of requests that would potentially be approved. The PBC charged the taskforce to reconvene and bring a revised recommendation back to the PBC (II.12). The Program Review Committee (PRC) also made a recommendation to PBC on September 7, 2010 (II.13) to establish a temporary process so that the timeline for the process would not be hindered. This temporary process was approved on September 16, 2010. However, knowing the importance of this process, the prioritization task force continued to meet until a new revised process was approved by PBC on January 13, 2011. This process was implemented in 2011 to assist the PBC in the prioritization of all of the requests that came forward from the annual unit plans of the divisions (II.14).

3. Budget Allocation Taskforce

The third summer task force of the PBC was the result of a discussion at the summer 2009 PBC Retreat that revolved around the use of a budget formula that could be used by the college to help develop an annual budget. The PBC tasked the group to formulate an allocation model that was equitable and based on data and best practices. This taskforce was led by the Vice President for Administrative Services. This taskforce also worked diligently through the summer, and, though several models were developed and revised, the taskforce could not find a model that performed to an acceptable level once the model was tested (II.15). This taskforce will reconvene in spring 2011 to continue its work.
Analysis of the Results Achieved:

The goal of the program review update (PRU) was fulfilled as the campus had:
- Demonstrated a 100% completion of PRU at the unit/discipline and department level.
- Received training on the purpose and the role of program review.
- Increased participation in the completion of program review.
- Completed the process in a more confident manner.
- Internalized the planning process with the establishment of goals and objectives that linked to institutional planning and budgeting.

The completion of this update also provided the groundwork for the processes that were developed in the current approach to the college’s program review process. The training and experience obtained by the faculty and staff in completing the documents and using the methods to prioritize and forward resource requests were evident in the success of the 2010-11 program review cycle.

An example of the success of the PRU 2009-10 is evident in the Culinary Department’s recent accreditation with the American Culinary Federation Education Foundation (ACFEF). The Culinary Department had the overall number one prioritized resource request, which was to provide the funds necessary to have the discipline accredited by its governing group; the department completed their certification successfully, and they were reaffirmed by ACFEF for continued accreditation of the Culinary department and first-time external accreditation of the Baking department on December 31, 2010 (II.16). This accreditation provides the students with a greater competitive edge in the employment market.

Planning Effectiveness:

The college used a variety of mechanisms to evaluate the effectiveness of the planning processes used by the college to ensure that it was working on continuous improvement. Evaluation tools are employed as opportunities to improve and monitor processes, procedures, and accountability of both the college plans and the college committees.

The first such evaluation occurred in December 2009 when all College Council committees were tasked with performing a self-evaluation of their committee activities (II.17). This evaluation process allowed the College Council to ensure that its committees were functioning. All committee self-evaluations were reviewed by an External Evaluation Committee. The external evaluation results were then reported out to College Council at its April 19, 2010 meeting (II.18). The co-chairs of the PBC met with the chairs of the committees to report out the results, allow the chairs of the committees to respond to external findings, and to devise plans on correcting any committee weaknesses that were identified through the process.

The PBC co-chairs also met with the chair of the External Evaluation Committee to obtain feedback on the external evaluation process. From this dialogue, it was determined that the
form used to conduct the external committee evaluation required modification. Both the College Council and the Academic Senate completed the entire evaluation process in the spring of 2010 and reported out their findings to their constituencies (Academic Senate November 9, 2010- College Council Retreat August 2010). Self-evaluations and external evaluations of committees will be performed annually each spring.

The second evaluation tool used by the college to assess the effectiveness of its planning processes for 2009 involved a survey of the campus community. At the PBC Retreat in the summer of 2009 it was decided that the college should conduct an annual survey of the campus to determine how effective the planning and budgeting processes were at the college. The survey instrument was developed and approved by the PBC in spring 2010 with the goal of gauging the extent to which the LATTC community understood the development and implementation of an integrated planning process (II.19). The survey was conducted in the fall of 2010, with the same survey completed at the Annual President’s Forum held on March 2, 2011. It was the desire of the PBC to evaluate the results of the initial survey (Fall 2010) and compare those results to the follow up survey (Spring 2011) when the annual planning cycle was completed (II.20). Thereafter the survey will be conducted annually to help determine areas needing improvement in all aspects of the planning cycle.

The results of the fall 2010 survey were reported to the campus by the PBC in December 2010 (II.21).

Recommendations that resulted from the fall 2010 LATTC Planning and Budgeting Effectiveness Survey:

1. Provide training to faculty and staff on the linkage of program review to planning and budgeting as well as how college plans all linked. Include planning timelines and the master planning calendar in training sessions.

2. Schedule opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to have open dialogue about the process of planning and budgeting. This could be conducted in a Town Hall-type of activity.

3. Ensure collaboration with campus groups to promote inclusion in planning processes. It is incumbent upon the college community to come together and dialogue about planning. Although faculty are represented on all college committees, some faculty continue to feel disengaged. It is paramount to the continued success of the college that all of the college get together for interaction about planning and budgeting, and how that all leads to student success.

4. Distribute the survey at a time where there is a maximum opportunity for a response rate, perhaps at the Annual President’s Forum in March.
5. Reduce the number of items on the survey although, due to the nature of comparing both fall 2010 and spring 2011 surveys, this change should not be made until after spring 2011.

Additional Plans:

The results of the fall 2010 LATTC Planning and Budget Effectiveness Survey will be compared to the results of the spring 2011 survey to develop an improvement plan for program review of 2011-12 for the planning year 2012-13. The survey instrument will also be evaluated by the PBC in spring 2011 for any revisions deemed necessary.

In addition to the campus wide surveys, the PBC developed a validation tool for itself to evaluate the effectiveness of the planning process (II.22)

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation:

Program Review 2010-2011

The college revised its program review design to an outcomes-based, integrated program review process incorporating linkages to institutional and program planning, budgeting, learning outcomes, and resource allocation. The framework of this process includes a comprehensive program review (CPR), an annual program review (APR), an annual unit plan (AUP) as well as a validation process.
1. Comprehensive Program Review (CPR)

The LATTC Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) facilitates campus wide participation in the establishment and sharing of long-term goals that inform institutional planning. In order to synchronize the program review and institutional planning, as well as make the process manageable by providing time for deeper analysis, the college is distributing the completion of CPR modules over a four-year period that coincides with the Institutional Planning Calendar (II.23). Modules of the comprehensive program review (CPR) are completed each year over this four-year cycle that directly relate to the college plan that is due to be updated in that planning year. Therefore, the modules and questions of CPR will be different every year according to the planning calendar and scheduled plan to be revised. The information obtained in these modules is then forwarded to the appropriate committee tasked with the updating of the plan.

In order to avoid a fragmented view and have a thorough picture, the fourth year of the CPR is devoted to reviewing and evaluating the previous three years of completed modules. The plan includes an annual evaluation of the CPR process to make any adjustments necessary and an overall meta-analysis of the CPR modularized approach that will be done at the conclusion of the full CPR cycle. Below is the breakdown of the CPR modules over the four-year cycle (II.24):
CPR 10-11 Modules: Strategic Master Plan and Matriculation

CPR 11-12 Modules: Education Master Plan, Effectiveness – Enrollment Trends, Curriculum, Staffing Trends, Environmental Scan

CPR 12-13 Modules: Student Equity Plan, Facilities (WEC), Technology (Tech Plan), Effectiveness - Student Success and Awards, Departmental Engagement, Instructional Support: Services and Activities

CPR 13-14 Modules: Professional Development, Grants, Programs, clubs, organizations and special activities, Effectiveness - Functions and Services, Meta-Analysis and Evaluation of all modules

In the 2010-11 program review, CPR modules were prepared with the intention of updating the Strategic Master Plan (SMP) and the Matriculation Plan, which are due for revision per the LATTC Planning Calendar. In order to make sure relevant information was collected to update scheduled college plans, the PRC requested each of the committees to compose specific questions that would be included in the CPR that were germane to the plan and the task of revising the plan. PBC forwarded 13 questions related to the SMP and the Matriculation Committee forwarded 3 questions related to the Matriculation Plan (II.25). The results of these questions will be forwarded to the committees in spring of 2011 so that they can begin their dialogue on the updating of their specific plan using data obtained from the entire campus through these CPR questions.

2. Annual Program Review (APR)

The Annual Program Review (APR) was created for annual reflection, evaluation, and analysis of the program’s achievements and issues. Overall the modules and questions of APR will remain the same every year until the end of the full cycle. These modules include: mission, recommendations from validations, reflection, service and learning outcomes, and external review and analysis (II.26).

3. Annual Unit Plan (AUP)

The Annual Unit Plan (AUP) is the planning component of the program review that includes goals, objectives, activities, and resource requests. The following sections were included in the planning documents (II.27):

- Basic Information
- Statement of Needs
- Linkage and Alignment – demonstrates the linkage of the Annual Unit Plan (AUP) with the Annual Program Review (APR) and Comprehensive Program Review (CPR), with campus strategic priorities and with alignment to the Program’s SLOs, PLOs, or SAOs.
- Impact – this defines whether any other program or department will be impacted by the planned activities
• Closing the Loop and Use of Results- this section analyzes the progress and the changes associated with this goal/activity, promoting accountability of the program as well as documenting results of implemented changes
• Identification and description of the requested resources by commitment item - this request also notes if it is a one-time or an on-going budget augmentation

4. Prioritization 2010-11

Prioritization of resource requests originates at the discipline/unit level; it is then transmitted to the department level and then forwarded to the division level so there is one comprehensive list of prioritized resource requests per division. The priority list for resources from each previous level was left the same and no request from that level could be addressed until the one preceding had been approved for the final prioritization. For example, no division’s number two on their priority list could be ranked until that division’s number one request had been approved into the final campus prioritization list ranking.

The prioritized list of resource requests by division was sent to PBC to merge all resource requests into one final list. This activity took place over the course of two days in special PBC meetings that were held on January 27th and 28th of 2011. As decided in the January 13, 2011 meeting of the PBC, 52 (25= Academic Affairs, 10 = Workforce and Economic Development, 10 = Student Services, 5 = Administrative Services, 2 = President’s Office) resource requests (excluding requests for permanent employees) were ranked by the members of the PBC (II.28). If the need arises and funding permits for more than 52 requests, the PBC would resume its prioritization. Requests for permanent employees are handled through a different process. For faculty hiring, the Faculty Hiring Priority Committee (FHPC) produces a list approved by the college president (II.29). For classified and administrator hiring, the constituency leaders are convened, hiring requests are reviewed, and a list is produced for presidential approval (II.30).

When the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) completed its work on prioritizing the 52 resource requests that were submitted through the annual unit planning process, the results were made readily available to the campus on February 8, 2011 (II.31). The campus is allowed to review this final listing for a 2-week period and lodge any questions, comments, or appeals to the PBC Co-chairs.

5. Validation

Validation of the 2010-11 program reviews was devised as an expansion of the pilot validation process that was conducted in the PRU of the previous year. The 2010-11 validations were done at two levels:

• Discipline level – At this level, program reviews were validated across divisions. This was done to share information outside the programs and to increase dialogue across the campus. The hope was to generate a better understanding and appreciation of programs and to foster collaboration.
• Department level – This was done to create dialogue and awareness within the division to facilitate the prioritization discussion and process (II.32).

6. Monitoring and Managing the Process

The creation and the adherence to the timeline for the 2010-11 program review was one of the most vital accomplishments of the entire process (II.33). This timeline was developed by PRC who took into account the time needed for successful completion at each level and, more importantly, the synchronization of the program review with the other processes at the institution such as FHPC and budget preparation. When the timeline and process document was presented to the Academic Senate on March 2, 2010 (II.34), it was requested that the document be modified and that an Academic Senate Representative be added to the validation process at the department level (II.35). The PRC made this change and the final program review timeline was approved by the PRC on March 3, 2010, and the Academic Senate on May 25, 2010. The document clearly outlines the process, the schedule of due dates, and the team memberships for both the development of the program review and for the validation of these program reviews.

During the implementation process this year, a two-phased approach was introduced. This was done to ease and manage the amount of work that was anticipated, as well as to coordinate the vocabulary and the processes with the future online district wide institutional effectiveness application. Phase 1 included the reflection and analysis of the program (CPR and APR) while Phase 2 revolved around planning (AUP) (II.36).

Every discipline, department, and division received a USB flash drive for program review 2010-11 that included the following information:

• The unit or disciplines’ completed PRU 2009-2010 document
• The validations of their PRU 2009-2010
• A timeline and reporting matrix for their 2010-2011 program review
• A data pack that included the reports of enrollment, success rates, retention rates, FTES, FTEF, achievements for their programs, as well as student survey data

All this information was also made available on the PRC web site (II.37). These flash drives were not distributed until the completion of the first training session. This forced each area to send at least one representative to trainings to begin the process.

The trainings for program review were extensive and had a high participation rate. A three month schedule of trainings was distributed at the fall 2010 convocation that offered at least three training sessions per week. In addition, the PRC Co-Chairs offered trainings for those who could not make the scheduled times. Overall, 35 meetings (about 56 hours of training) occurred with 277 employees participating (II.38).

At the conclusion of the process the PRC presented a survey to the campus to get its overall response and feedback to the process (II.39).
Analysis of Results Achieved:

The success of the LATTC program review process is evident in the 100% completion rate (148 completed). Overall 204 goals, with 360 objectives and 643 activities, were submitted. There were 440 activity and resource request forms submitted. All these requests were collected into one database for the division prioritization process (II.40).

Since the program review process was fashioned after last year’s PRU, faculty and staff were familiar with the process. Trainings were well attended and the improvement of the program review quality was substantial compared to the previous year’s program review outcomes. The similarity of the process and extensive trainings prepared faculty and staff well, resulting in better educated, experienced, and involved participants. This year, 216 members participated in the program review process (II.41).

A well thought out and devised timeline guided the campus as it moved through the process with each step consisting of clearly defined due dates and validation team members. The validation process included many different members of the campus and received positive feedback as a best practice and served as a tool for improving the quality of the program documents, learning about each other’s programs, and providing feedback to the Program Review Committee. There were 115 staff members who participated in the validation process (II.42). The process was so well accepted that it was decided to implement a similar one for the SLO assessment and the PBC planning process (II.43).

Completed program reviews and validation reports were posted on the PRC website (II.44). Many areas used these completed documents as examples to help them complete their own program reviews.

Additional Plans:

LATTC will further enhance validation processes to facilitate more dialogue leading to continued improvement and expanded communication in support of institutional effectiveness.

The PRC strategically included the LACCD Institutional Effectiveness System in its discussions during development of the CPR, APR, and AUP because the program review process will eventually go on-line using LACCD support (II.45). Additionally, the PBC plans to develop and approve a prioritization rubric by September 2011.

The specific data from PR will be retrieved, compiled, and delivered to the appropriate committees for review and use. Thorough analysis of the program review documents and evaluations of the process will be completed in spring 2011. The PRC will propose an updated timeline and process document that will be used for the 2011-12 program review cycle. A complete meta-analysis will be conducted by the PRC at the end of the full cycle of the CPR.
It is believed that with the completion of a well-structured assessment plan this semester and with better integration and use of assessment results, program review quality will improve. One of the final steps of SLO assessment is the dialogue of departments about their findings, their recommended changes, and their resource requests. As the departments discuss and identify these areas, they are recorded on a Departmental Dialogue form. The information on this form directly relates to those areas in their program reviews. Once this information is gathered, it will be collected and inserted into their program reviews for 2011-12. Each department will be able to report on the progress they have made based on these assessments and use the outcomes of the dialogue to develop changes and/or resource requests to improve student learning.
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College Recommendation 3-Theme: Student Learning Outcomes

The Commission notes the considerable good work done by Los Angeles Trade Technical College to address recommendations and come into compliance with standards. Much of the work is done, and what remains is simply a full opportunity to implement new practices and assess their effectiveness. The Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2011 should demonstrate the institution’s final resolution of the recommendations below:

In order to meet the standards by 2012, the team recommends that the college establish a formal review and evaluation process at the department level that will allow faculty and/or staff to dialogue about SLOs and continuous improvement. The process should be documented for tracking and program improvement purposes. Student learning outcomes must be clearly, accurately, and consistently stated in print and electronic documents. The training of faculty and staff for a clearer understanding and relationship between program review and student learning outcomes is essential. (Std. IIA.2.e, IIA.2.f, IIA.6.c)

Findings of the Evaluation Report:

The 2009 Evaluation report stated many concerns about the student learning outcomes (SLO) process at Los Angeles Trade Technical College (LATTC). They included:

- That, at the course level, SLOs were not included on curriculum updates or outlines.
- That, at the program level, Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) had not been clearly defined, and SLOs had not been developed in LATTC’s Student Services areas.
- That General Education departments did not show evidence of PLOs or SLOs.
- That development and implementation of the assessment cycle based on SLOs had not progressed significantly.
- That there were inconsistencies in the publication of SLOs/SAOs in written documents, the catalog, and on the website.

Introduction:

In order to respond to Recommendation Three of the ACCJC visiting team’s Evaluation Report from 2009, the Academic Senate’s Curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes, and Program Review Committees worked with the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) to develop plans and consistent documents leading to the development of the Assessment Management Plan (AMP). The AMP was devised so that a formal review and evaluation process could occur at the department level, allowing faculty and/or staff to dialogue about SLOs and continuous improvements.

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation:

In 2009-2010, the Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLOC) created the Assessment Management Plan (AMP) to address the college’s need to engage in systematic evaluation and integrated planning related to SLOs. The AMP establishes processes for how each
course, program, and degree will be evaluated and assessed and when this will occur. The current AMP period is 2010-2013 (III.1). This plan will be evaluated in 2012, with a new plan prepared during the 2012-2013 academic year. The next AMP will be ready for implementation in fall 2013 (III.2).

The AMP was based on the course-level SLO process that had begun with each department in the fall of 2008 and with the completion of pilot course SLO assessment and evaluation to determine successful models. This process continues as additional assessments are performed.

When the action letter arrived in June 2010 stating that the college needed to respond to the progress it had made on SLOs, the Accreditation Steering Committee determined that not enough progress had been made on SLOs to meet the accreditation standards required for 2012. The Academic Senate and the ASC took immediate steps to work in concert leading SLO assessments for the 2010-2011 academic year (III.3).

The ASC defined the following goals for fall 2010:

1. The Academic Senate would designate LATTC’s opening day convocation focus be on the importance of the completion of SLO assessments and provide initial training to get the process started (III.4).
2. The college would assess 50% of its course offerings in the fall of 2010 (III.5).
3. All courses not taught between fall 2010 and summer 2011 would be archived. This would help clarify which courses were required to be assessed (III.6).
4. Every course that was to be assessed in fall 2010 would be updated through the curriculum committee using the district’s Electronic Curriculum Development (ECD) system and would include the course SLOs (III.7).
5. Extensive training sessions would be provided to ensure that the process was clearly and consistently understood (III.8).
6. As a sign of institutional commitment, the college would advertise and hire a full time learning assessment coordinator (1.0 release) as well as an assessment trainer (0.4 release), an increase to 1.4 release from the .6 release that had been assigned for the SLO Coordinator in the past (III.9).
7. The college would focus on the assessment of classroom SLOs in fall 2010 and the assessment of PLOs and SAOs in spring 2011 (III.10).

On August 26, 2010 the campus held its opening day convocation. Although diverse opening day business was discussed, including updates on LATTC’s accreditation progress, the focus of this day was on the importance of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and service area outcomes (SAOs) to college planning for student success. An entire session of the convocation was facilitated by the SLO coordinator (III.11) in order to:

1. Emphasize the importance of SLO/SAO development.
2. Explain how the assessment of these outcomes links to program review and planning.
3. Review the procedures presented for the assessment of SLO/SAO in the AMP.
4. Summarize each area’s progress in the assessment of their stated outcomes.
5. Present the LATTC Core Competencies approved by the Academic Senate on March 9, 2010 (III.12):

A. Students will use critical thinking skills to gather, identify, analyze, synthesize information, and evaluate problems and solutions.
B. Students will use visual, numerical, verbal, written, and practical skills to create useful and original products.
C. Students will demonstrate technical skills that meet industry and/or employment standards.
D. Students will demonstrate effective communication and comprehension skills.
E. Students will demonstrate ability to interface in a culturally diverse socio-economic environment.

At the conclusion of the presentation, instructional departments convened to complete the following two assignments:

1. Using a list of the department’s fall 2010 offerings, the departments (III.13):
   - Declared which courses would be assessed in fall 2010 (the goal was 50%).
   - Confirmed that all courses had clear SLOs that were used by all sections.
   - Identified a “Course Captain” (person taking the lead for gathering assessment information) for each course selected by the department to be assessed in fall 2010.

2. A rubric that had been developed by the SLO Coordinator was used as a self-evaluation tool to measure the progress made by the department on the entire SLO process (III.14).

In addition, each department was provided:

1. Their assessment Red Book, named because of its red binder, which included copies of all the forms necessary to complete outcomes assessment.
2. Written instructions on how to properly complete each of the sections of the Red Book and examples of each.

The Red Book contained the following forms approved as part of the Assessment Management Plan (AMP):

1. A course list form (Form 1) that was used to specify information for all courses within each department and to identify courses that needed to be archived and/or updated (III.15)
2. A Course SLO Form (Form 2) that was used to declare the SLOs and criteria that would be used for the assessment (III.16).
3. A Course Assessment Form (Form 3) that would be used to complete the assessment of the course (III.17).
4. A Program Curricular Map that was used to link SLOs to department PLOs or to LATTC Core Competencies (III.18).
5. A Program Learning Outcome Form that was used to declare the PLOs and the criteria that would be used for the assessment (III.19).
6. A PLO Assessment Form that would be used to complete the assessment of the program (III.20).
7. An SLO quiz that was administered by instructors to their students to help the campus identify student understanding of SLOs (III.21).

The SLO Coordinator and a panel of assistants were available to guide the departments through these assignments. At the end of the session, departments reported out on their self-evaluation rubric. The average score on these self-evaluation rubrics was 3.5 – with 10 being the highest score (III.22). This was a clear indication to the campus that departments needed to make more definitive progress on the identification and assessment of SLOs.

The departments reported that a great deal of dialogue had taken place in their department meetings on their SLO process, but that confusion still remained on the procedures of the process. It was obvious to the departments what was needed at the beginning and at the end of the process, but the departments were uncertain as to the steps necessary to connect the beginning to the end. With this information, the SLO Coordinator then scheduled additional training dates with these departments where they could meet individually to clarify these steps (III.23).

Based on the information collected that day, 347 instructional course assessments (approximately 50% of the total fall course offerings) were targeted to be completed by the end of the fall 2010 semester.

As further assurance that SLOs were being incorporated in courses by instructors in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), a district-wide policy was approved by the LACCD Board of Trustees stating that every course syllabus must contain the course SLO(s) (III.24). The two vice presidents of instructional programs tasked the deans of their respective areas with the collection and review of the syllabi for SLOs as well as other pertinent information. A campus syllabus checklist was used to complete this task (III.25).

On March 9, 2010 the Academic Senate passed a motion from its Curriculum Committee that all course archives would be approved through a Consent Agenda to help expedite the process (III.26). However, course updates were not included in the Consent Agenda. On average, the Curriculum Committee was forwarding between 30 and 40 course updates for approval at each Academic Senate meeting (III.27). Although the ASC proffered a goal to update every course outline that was assessed in fall 2010 to include the SLO in the new ECD system, by November of 2010 it became clear that there simply was not enough time or resources to complete this task. Therefore the Faculty Accreditation Chair (FAC) recommended that departments devise a monthly plan which they would include in their assessment Red Book to indicate the month and year course updates would be completed (III.28). This document specified a lead person within the department responsible for the update, and, at the same time, provided the Curriculum Committee with an opportunity to better plan for the number of courses projected to be updated each month.

Training sessions were offered by the SLO coordinator to help departments develop their curricular maps for each program that offer a certificate or degree; these curricular maps link the department’s SLOs to their PLOs and the LATTC Core Competencies. Areas that do not offer a certificate or degree were asked to align their courses with the LATTC Core
Competencies (III.29). These curricular maps assured the creation of a process that will systematically support the attainment of learning outcomes.

These trainings that were offered at the beginning of the semester provided strategies for all members of the departments on how to properly gather information, assess SLOs, and complete the proper assessment form (III.30). However, the campus faculty and staff were focused on the completion of the program review process, which had been a driving force of the 2010 Follow Up Report, so attendance at these initial trainings was not as robust as anticipated.

The college wanted to ensure that students understood the purpose of SLOs. To that end, a simple quiz to help demonstrate the student’s understanding of SLOs was provided to instructors in their Red Books to administer (the quiz was also conveniently posted in Moodle for electronic submission). The three (3) question quiz was used to identify the level of comprehension students had of SLOs (III.31). The three questions were:

1. What is a Student Learning Outcome?
2. What is a Student Learning Outcome for this course?
3. What classroom activities or assignments will help me reach this outcome?

LATTC’s Associated Student Organization also spent the first few days of the fall semester trying to get the students to ask about SLOs. The first week of classes, members of ASO were granted permission to write in chalk on walkways and walls messages pertaining to SLOs (III.32). Messages that were written included “What is an SLO? Ask your instructor” and “SLO, what does it mean for you?” Both of these efforts were attempts to increase the student’s understanding and awareness of student learning outcomes and their importance to the courses they take and their overall success.

In November of 2010, the SLO Coordinator made the decision to resign due to other commitments in his department (III.33). Although the decision had been made to hire an Assessment Coordinator and an Assessment Trainer, these positions were still in the process of being cleared at the District level in November 2010. It was evident to the department chairs, deans, and vice presidents at the Academic Council meeting held on November 4, 2010 that there was still a great deal of confusion with regard to the SLO process. Chairs were unclear of which documents were to be completed and the due dates for each submittal. It was also evident that many chairs and deans were confused as to how these SLOs would be an instrumental part of their future Program Reviews (III.34).

Immediately after this meeting, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and Faculty Accreditation Chair (FAC) met to formulate a plan, which they presented to the ASC at its November 8, 2010 meeting (III.35). This plan included:

1. Additional mandatory training sessions for all departments on the Red Book that included:
   a. Additional instruction on how to successfully complete the department overview, which included clarifying which courses they were assessing, status of archived classes, and status on course updates. This was when the
departments were advised to create their monthly curriculum update plan if these updates had not been completed.

b. Review of random assessment definition pages for clear assessment criteria.

c. Further training on how to successfully complete course assessment forms. This section of the training also included time to answer questions on sections of the assessment forms and explain how these forms would link with program review.

d. Explanation of the LATTC Core Competencies and the importance of PLOs.

e. Training on curricular maps that link SLOs to the LATTC Core Competencies or PLOs.

f. Basic instructions on procedures for completing PLO assessment forms.

2. Clear due dates for the completion of the assessment Red Books (December 13 and January 5).

3. Assessment update checks by the deans between November 22, 2010 and November 24, 2010. This spot check included a rubric checklist that the deans and chairs used to gauge how far along the departments were in the process, and to provide feedback to areas yet to be completed as well as links to examples of the documents that might be missing (III.36).

4. It was also agreed that the FAC would assume responsibility to assist the campus in the completion of the work it had started on assessments of SLOs. This would continue until the Assessment Coordinator and the Assessment Trainer were hired (III.37).

Trainings occurred between November 15, 2010 and November 23, 2010. Department level program reviews had already been submitted, and departments were now focusing on the completion of their assessments (III.38). Feedback from these trainings was positive, and many departments stated that they understood and were confident about what was needed to complete this first round of assessment books and how this work was to be done. Both the deans and department chairs agreed that these department checks using the rubric also provided them with definitive information of what was due and how it should be completed.

During the first weeks of December, the ALO and the FAC met again to discuss and devise future plans for the assessment process. Since departments had spent so much time on these assessments as it was really the first time the campus went through the process, it was suggested that an instantaneous report be given to department chairs to show that their work was being reviewed and to provide them immediate feedback on how well they had completed the process. It was also recommended that the data from the assessment forms (many of which were in hard copy only) be transferred into an electronic database so that future reports and studies on the data could be performed. These discussions and ideas were vetted with the ASC on December 13, 2010 and resulted in the following steps:

1. During the week of December 13-17, the completed Red Books were collected by the area deans. A summary report (III.39) was prepared by the dean that indicated:
   - Which SLO assessment documents had been submitted.
• Which SLO assessment documents were not submitted and a date for when these missing SLO assessments would be submitted.
• Whether the Curricular Map was submitted, and, if not, a date when this missing Curricular Map would be submitted.
• Whether PLOs had been established for those programs offering certificates or degrees and, if not, a date when these PLOs would be defined.

2. After the Red Books were collected and the deans provided this initial summary of completion, the data from the assessment forms was converted to electronic files for storage and then hand transferred into databases (III.40). Between December 15, 2010 and January 3, 2011, the FAC took the information from these databases and transferred it to a one page (front and back) SLO Feedback Form. This form replicated much of the information from the submitted assessment forms and then provided two areas for feedback to the departments: Commendations and Recommendations (III.41).

3. Once these forms were generated for a department’s courses, the FAC randomly selected a few courses and provided initial feedback in the form of the Commendations and Recommendations (III.42).

4. Once the FAC had completed this random selection of feedback forms, the entire batch of department feedback forms were then forwarded to the appropriate area dean. The dean was then instructed to provide commendations and recommendations on the remainder of the forms before returning them to the department chairs (III.43).

This process not only provided feedback to the departments but also provided an opportunity for the deans to understand what their areas were stating in terms of resources and changes that might have to occur based upon the assessment outcome analysis from these courses. All these feedback forms were completed and returned to the department chairs by January of 2011.

In early January, the FAC and ALO met once again to discuss what should be done with this information that had been collected. From these discussions, two additional processes, including the forms to document the processes, were proposed to the ASC and the Academic Council. The first process was to form a pilot validation group, who would analyze a random selection of courses from all instructional areas. A form was created to rate these identified assessments (III.44). This validation group met on January 13, 2011 to launch this process (III.45). The purpose of this validation process was to distinguish areas of the assessment process for which it appeared the campus needed further trainings.

The second additional process was to provide the opportunity and the tools necessary for disciplines to dialogue about assessment results. The Discipline Dialogue form was created and departments were tasked with meeting early in the spring semester so that staff could review assessments results and record information that they obtained (III.46). When completed, this dialogue form will inform and automatically be uploaded into the discipline’s 2011-12 program reviews. This allows for the completion of the cycle of using SLO assessment results to inform program review and planning.
Service areas had received trainings on the differences between SLOs and SAOs and the development of both of these outcomes from a skilled consultant affiliated with the RP Group in both 2009 and 2010 (III.47). As planned, service areas, such as Student Services and Administrative Services, continued their trainings with college representatives at the start of the spring semester 2011. This training helped place the service areas in line with the processes and procedures that the instructional departments had completed in the fall of 2010. The FAC and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) met with the Student Services division on January 26, 2011 and the Administrative Services division on March 8, 2011 (III.48). During these trainings, these groups were given their Red Books and instructions on how to successfully complete the three forms that it contained. These forms are:

1. Form 1 - A spreadsheet that defines the area’s SAOs and SLOs, the person accountable for their assessment, a planned date of assessment completion, and a place to identify if the SAO or SLO have assessment criteria and an assessment tool (III.49).
2. Form 2 - The area’s Curricular Map that identifies how the SLOs and SAOs relate to each other as well as how they each relate to the LATTC Core Competencies (III.50).
3. Form 3 - The assessment form that will be used to complete the assessment of the area’s SAO or SLO (III.51).
4. A timeline for the completion of each of the forms and a due date for the completed assessments (III.52).

These trainings facilitated lively discussion and served to answer questions the service areas still had about the process. More importantly, this established a routine for the entire campus that was similar and would allow data to be gathered from both instructional and service areas that was consistent.

As an electronic database of SLOs that were completed in fall 2010 had been established, the college finally had the ability to seamlessly publish these SLOs on its website. At the ASC meeting on January 31, 2011, it was recommended these outcomes be posted on the campus schedule page (III.53). On February 7, 2011, the Dean of IE and the FAC met with the designer of the campus’s scheduling page to place the SLOs right into the online schedule. This permits students to obtain information on the course, including time, instructor and location, course description as well as the SLO(s), before they add the class to their schedule (III.54).

**Analysis of the Results Achieved**

LATTC successfully completed assessments of over 415 courses in fall 2010 (III.55). Between June 2010 and December 2010, 963 courses that were not scheduled to be taught by departments this academic year had been archived (III.56). Additionally, 145 courses had been updated through the ECD system to include the courses’ SLOs (III.57). LATTC is also able to report that approximately 70 more courses were assessed in the fall of 2010 than had been planned at its August 2010 convocation. Additionally, the majority of departments that
offer a degree or certificate have identified program learning outcomes (PLOs) that are directly linked to the college’s core competencies through a curricular map (III.58). This serves as evidence that LATTC is committed to assessing SLOs as a means to improve student success and institutional effectiveness.

Assessment summaries and feedback forms received praise from various departments for their quick reference information. Departments were clear on assessments that they had completed, were provided with information on assessments that had not been completed or were missing on their initial Red Book submissions, and were able to schedule a new due date with their deans for their completion. In addition, it provided them a receipt and recognition of their fall work.

Validation results of the assessments indicated that departments needed additional trainings on certain areas of the assessments. Although many courses were found to have criteria deemed appropriate for successful assessment of the SLO, many assessments were lacking in results in the “findings section” of the form and in listing resources needed for improvement (III.59). It is believed that with additional trainings on understanding how assessment results form the basis for program review for fall 2011, with the interaction and reflection the discipline dialogue process will provide, and with experience from participation in fall 2010 assessments, the complete cycle of SLO assessments should show increased improvement and engagement in spring 2011.

A great deal of discussion took place within the pilot validation group over the selected assessments, resulting in a “parking lot” of ideas for future trainings and suggestions for improvements to the assessment process (III.60). These ideas will be incorporated into the planned trainings for spring 2011 and into the meta-analysis of the Assessment Management Plan and Red Book forms by the SLO Committee at the end 2010-11.

Additional Plans:

There are 343 courses scheduled for assessment in the spring of 2011. Departments will define the “Course Captains” to take charge of completing the assessment, the SLOs for the courses to be assessed, the criteria for the assessments, and the assessment tool on both Form 1 and Form 2 in their Red Books by the end of February 2011 (III.61).

Every department that offers a degree or certificate has been tasked with completing at least one PLO assessment in spring 2011. A PLO assessment form (Form 6 in Red Book) will be used to collect data and record results (III.62).

Service areas have defined both SAOs and SLOs. In conjunction with PLOs on the instructional side, service areas have been tasked with the completion of at least one SAO in the spring of 2011. An SAO/SLO assessment form (Form 3 in the Service Area Red Books) will be used to collect data and record results (III.63).

Department chairs will schedule a meeting date to review and discuss their assessment results. This dialogue will be scheduled with their area dean by February 28, 2011 and be
completed by March 25, 2011 (III.64). The deans will be ensuring that faculty and staff are involved and engaged to gain further insight into the learning outcomes achieved and the resources needed to support student success across divisions. The goal of these meetings will be to review all the fall 2010 assessments from the discipline and identify the key points that surfaced from the assessment results. With the completion of this dialogue form, disciplines will successfully demonstrate the connection between student learning and their outcome assessments, the linkage of these assessments to their program review, and then the linkage of both SLO/SAO assessment and program review to overall institutional planning and to the improvement of institutional effectiveness.
### Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III.1</th>
<th>Assessment Management Plan, 2010-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>LATTC Planning Cycle Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3</td>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee August 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes referring to Board of Trustees-Student Success Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4</td>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee August 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes referring to Board of Trustees-Student Success Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.5</td>
<td>February 24, 2011 Memo to Department Chairs from M. Drummond &amp; D. Harrington Convocation SLO Slide Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee August 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee August 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee August 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9</td>
<td>Accreditation Steering Committee September 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome Committee February 16, 2011 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.11</td>
<td>Convocation Announcement September 9, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.12</td>
<td>Academic Senate March 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.13</td>
<td>Convocation handout listing courses taught in Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.14</td>
<td>SLO Self Evaluation Progress Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.15</td>
<td>Form 1 - Red Book, Department Course Assessment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.16</td>
<td>Form 2 - Red Book, SLO Outcome Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.17</td>
<td>Form 3 - Red Book, SLO Assessment Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.18</td>
<td>Curricular Map-Red Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.19</td>
<td>PLO Form 4 - Red Book, Program Learning Outcome Assessment Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.20</td>
<td>PLO Assessment Form 6 - Red Book, PLO Assessment Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.21  SLO Quiz - Red Book
III.22  Self Evaluation Rubric Results from Tom Vessella
III.23  Training Schedules from Tom Vessella
III.24  Board of Trustees Decision on SLOs on Course Syllabi
III.25  LATTC Campus Syllabus Evaluation Checklist
III.26  Academic Senate March 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes
III.27  Various Senate Meeting Minutes showing large number of updates approved
III.28  Example of Course Update Plan from BSS Department
III.29  Core Competencies
III.30  Training Schedules from Tom Vessella
III.31  SLO Quiz - Red Book
III.32  Accreditation Steering Committee August 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes
III.33  Accreditation Steering Committee November 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes
III.34  Academic Council November 4, 2010 Meeting Minutes
III.35  Accreditation Steering Committee November 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes
III.36  Example Dean Assessment
III.37  Accreditation Steering Committee November 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes
III.38  World Tour Meeting Notes
III.39  Example Dean Assessment
III.40  Example of databases
III.41  Feedback Form
III.42  Validation Group January 12, 2011 Meeting Minutes
III.43 Examples of English SLO Assessment with Commendations and Recommendations

III.44 SLO Assessment Validation Form

III.45 Validation Group January 12, 2011 Meeting Minutes

III.46 Completed Discipline Dialogue Form

III.47 Initial Service Area SLO and SAO Training Dates

III.48 Additional Service Area SLO and SAO Training Dates

III.49 AS/SS Form 1

III.50 AS/SS Form 2

III.51 AS/SS Form 3

III.52 Time Line

III.53 Accreditation Steering Committee January 31, 2011 Meeting Minutes

III.54 Screenshot of Scheduler with Course Description and SLO

III.55 J. Babb – March 1, 2011 email, Department Course Assessments

III.56 J. Babb – Course Archive Report

III.57 J. Babb – March 1, 2011 email, Department Course Updates

III.58 Personal Development Example – Curricular Map, SLO/Core Competencies

III.59 Validation Group January 12, 2011 Meeting Minutes

III.60 Parking lot items from Validation Meeting

III.61 Form 1 and 2 from AS, SS, and AA

III.62 PLO Assessment Form

III.63 SAO Assessment Form

III.64 Academic Council February 3, 2011 Minutes
College Recommendation 4 – Theme: Leadership Stability

The Commission notes the considerable good work done by Los Angeles Trade Technical College to address recommendations and come into compliance with standards. Much of the work is done, and what remains is simply a full opportunity to implement new practices and assess their effectiveness. The Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2011 should demonstrate the institution’s final resolution of the recommendations below:

In order to meet standards, the team recommends that the college, working collaboratively with the district office, take steps to stem the turnover of senior management. The college requires a stable, experienced administrative team to meet many of its recommendations. Administrative turnover, especially within the ranks of senior management, is concerning. (Std.III.A.2, ER 5)

Findings of the 2010 Evaluation Report:

While the visiting team’s report in 2009 confirmed that “LATTC generally has sufficient staff, with appropriate credentials, preparation and experience, to provide the administrative services necessary to support its size, mission and purpose,” they also concluded “that the high turnover rate of the presidents and administrators during this last accreditation cycle contributed to the college’s challenges in meeting the standards.” The 2009 Evaluation Report emphasized several high-ranking positions, including the president, three of the four vice presidents, and a couple of dean positions, as appearing to be recent hires. In the 2010 visiting report, no other notations were given except to iterate that, especially in terms of senior management, the team remained concerned about the college developing a “stable, experienced administrative team” to continue to meet the standards of accreditation set forth by ACCJC.

Introduction:

Los Angeles Trade Technical College (LATTC) agrees with the team that turnover of senior management can have a negative effect on the organization and on its ability to meet accreditation standards. Since the senior management of the college is responsible for charting the course of the college including developing its mission and vision, implementing college plans, policies, procedures, and communications, it was apparent that the turnover rate experienced at the college at the time of the preparation of the self-study and the on-site visit had impacted the ability of the college to fully address prior recommendations and demonstrate that the college was meeting accreditation standards.

At the moment in time of the preparation of the self-study, it was true that there had been a pattern of several instances of presidents serving in interim or acting capacities in the previous twelve-year time frame. However, the following paragraphs detail how, beginning with the appointment of President Chapdelaine in 2006, LATTC has in fact reversed this pattern and continues to grow its leadership capacity.

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation:
The college is happy to report that the leadership of the college has stabilized. The president began his fifth academic year as president in fall 2010. The president’s team of senior leaders, the vice presidents, are all permanent employees. Two of the four vice presidents have over five years of experience as a vice president at LATTC – the vice president for Workforce and Economic Development and the vice president for Student Services. The vice president for Administrative Services has over two years of experience at LATTC and almost six years of experience as a vice president for Administrative Services in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). The newest member of the senior administrative team, the vice president for Academic Affairs, has almost 20 years in the LACCD as a faculty member and over four years experience as a dean; she started as the permanent vice president for Academic Affairs in August 2010 (IV.1)

The next level, the deans and classified managers, are all permanent employees. The college does not have any one in its leadership ranks that is in an acting capacity. The college fully understands the import of consistency in the leadership of the college to ensure that accreditation standards are fully met.

**Analysis of Results Achieved:**

Responding to this recommendation provided the college with the opportunity to study the literature on administrator turnover (IV.2). The literature was sparse on the topic of administrator turnover; however, there were many articles on the topic of succession planning. The literature described the need for organizations to prepare for retirements and emergency replacements by identifying and mentoring, training, and coaching those individuals who have been selected as capable of assuming higher positions in the college.

It was clear from the literature that the problem of administrator turnover, either by planned retirement, by an executive leaving the company, or by other emergencies such as an unexpected death, is shared by many organizations in the public and private sectors. The negative effects of this turnover impacts the organization in the down time that exists while searching for a replacement and the replacement becoming situated in the new position. During this time the institution typically suffers losses and/or setbacks due to the time it takes the new administrator to learn the organizational culture, to fully understand the institutional mission, and to continue to implement the strategic objectives of the organization. The literature indicates that the lost time could be as much as two years. Even in good economic times, two years of adjustment for a college administrator could result in lower enrollment. For LATTC the administrator turnover had a definite effect on its enrollment. An enrollment roller coaster occurred at LATTC in a 10-year period from 1999-00 through 2008-09. Finally in the 2008-09 academic year the college recovered its enrollment to above the level it had been for over a decade. As a matter of fact, the level of enrollment achieved for 2008-09 had not been seen at the college since the mid-1970s. The college had a shift downward of enrollment in 2009-10 due to the workload reduction from the State. Had this adjustment not occurred, the college enrollment would have continued to grow (IV.3). The stable leadership facilitated strong enrollment planning that the college undertook and has institutionalized over the past two years (IV.4). Reliance on the use of data in scheduling has contributed to
this improvement and was made possible by the experienced team of the president and vice presidents working in concert with the deans and department chairs.

The college has operated with a reserve for two years and will continue to operate within its budget. This can also be attributed to stable leadership in the administrative ranks working in cooperation with faculty and staff.

The situations illustrated above support the idea that stable leadership is necessary for an organization to reach its potential and to continue to flourish.

**Additional Plans:**

The literature indicated that the institution should develop its own succession plan and that is vitally important to LATTC. As a result, LATTC is drafting an outline of its succession plan that will be vetted through its college governance process. By the time of the mid-term report, LATTC will have a finalized succession plan to ensure long-term stability in its leadership.
Evidence

IV.1 LATTC Personnel Changes – Administrators 2008-2010
IV.2 Full Literature Review Report
IV.3 LACCD FTES Trends Report
IV.4 Enrollment Management Plan
College Recommendation 5-Theme: Communication

The Commission notes the considerable good work done by Los Angeles Trade Technical College to address recommendations and come into compliance with standards. Much of the work is done, and what remains is simply a full opportunity to implement new practices and assess their effectiveness. The Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2011 should demonstrate the institution’s final resolution of the recommendations below:

In order to exceed the standards the team recommends the college work to improve communication between the district and the college’s constituent groups. District committees which have a direct relationship with campus committees, such as Student Success, should develop a seamless process of communication and reporting. (Std.IV.A.3)

Findings of the 2010 Evaluation Report:

The visiting team has recommended that the college improve and enhance the information flowing between the district and the college constituency groups. The team also requested that the district-college communication process be seamless and easily accessible.

Introduction:

In order to resolve Recommendation Five of the Evaluation Report, LATTC’s Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) assumed responsibility for developing new web pages detailing district and college committee membership in an effort to improve the two-way flow of information between the district and campus committees. The design of pages emphasizes simple navigation for all college personnel. The ASC additionally began working with LACCD’s Office of Educational Services and Institutional Effectiveness to explore ways of improving communication and the flow of information between the District’s governance committees and all nine of LACCD’s colleges.

Actions Taken to Resolve the Recommendation:

Development of District/College Communication Webpage

The ASC developed a new District/College Communication webpage on the LATTC website to provide easy access to critical information on one comprehensive site.
Welcome to the District/College Communication Website

Communication between Los Angeles Trade Technical College and Los Angeles Community College District is critical to its educational mission of high quality. This website is designed to enhance communication by providing new information and resources for college employees, board, district decisions and governance. In addition, this website will offer information about college representation on district committees, responsible for creating the best possible educational environment on all of the LA Community College District campuses. The pages also will provide a visual tool for locating and accessing information from the district's campus and various areas. There also will be more room posted for college employees to learn about and take action on issues from the district. This site will be an excellent place to find important changes or actions at Los Angeles Community College District campuses.

ACCJC Recommendation #5: Communication

In order to meet the standards the task force recommends the college needs to improve communication between the district and the college's constituent groups. District committees within have a direct relationship with campus committee, such as Student Senate, should develop a method of communication and reporting.

Action Taken to Fulfill the Recommendation: The report from the task force in March 2010 included a comprehensive list of college representatives as well as a list of the committees to the college's constituent groups. The task force also identified five areas for improvement in the new Los Angeles Community College District: communication, website development, and reporting. The task force recommended that the college develop a comprehensive website to provide easy access to critical information. Included in this website:

- A comprehensive list of college representatives as well as a list of the committees to the college's constituent groups
- A comprehensive list of college representatives as well as a list of the committees to the college's constituent groups
- A comprehensive list of college representatives as well as a list of the committees to the college's constituent groups
- A comprehensive list of college representatives as well as a list of the committees to the college's constituent groups
- A comprehensive list of college representatives as well as a list of the committees to the college's constituent groups

This site is used to post important district-to-college information, as well as provide direct links to the district committee web pages, their minutes, and their agendas. It also provides links to the minutes and agendas from the Board of Trustees’ meetings.
The LATTC District College Communication Webpage contains a feature that helps identify the location of important news articles, district directives, and other informational documents.

The site also enables information to flow from the college to the district. For example, the Public Relations Office at Los Angeles Trade-Technical College currently produces a series of online newsletters that focus on Accreditation, campus construction, College Council decisions, messages from the president and special campus events that now are easily accessible online by the Chancellor’s office, the Board of Trustees, and district personnel.

Identifying College Representatives on District Committees

The Accreditation Steering Committee identified six district committees which LATTC faculty, students, and staff serve as members. These district committees align with campus committees having the same charges. A comprehensive list of the campus representatives, the district committees on which they serve, and contact information for each is posted on the new District/College Communication webpage. With this information, members of the campus can easily identify and contact these representatives about district decisions, planning, and policies.
The listing of representatives reinforces accountability amongst these committee representatives and encourages them to report their information back to their constituent groups and related committees.

Developing a Communication Flow Chart

A comprehensive flow chart for these identified District committees has been created and placed on the District/College Communication webpage. This flowchart details how information travels and how committees are linked to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and/or other LACCD colleges.
Partnering with the District

The college has a dynamic and collegial relationship with the district office and often serves as the site for many district-wide meetings (V.1). While responding to this recommendation gave the college the opportunity to strengthen its flow of communication, it also aided district efforts to provide timely and easy-to-access information. The following key responses were undertaken at the district level:

A staff member was assigned to collect and post the minutes of district committees whose minutes were not current. The missing minutes are now posted and up-to-date (V.2).

1. The Interim Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Institutional Effectiveness conducted a conference call with all the chairs of District-level Governance Committees to explain the new process for getting minutes and agenda items to her staff for posting to the district website. It has been established that minutes will be posted within one week of approval and agendas to be posted 72 hours in advance of a meeting. She also explained the new LACCD 411 page (detailed in the Additional Plans section below) and asked that each month committee chairs provide updates to post on this page (V.2).

2. The District IT Office added a “Quick Search” feature on the District website so that one can search through the minutes of Board of Trustee meetings for specific information (V.3).

Additionally, the college hosted five LACCD Board of Trustees meetings (V.4). Since many district-wide issues are discussed and voted upon at Board meetings, campus constituents had a frequent opportunity to learn about district issues firsthand and to offer input directly to the chancellor and the LACCD Board of Trustees. These meetings gave constituents a chance to
voice opinions directly to the policymakers as well as listen to the views of campus union representatives, the presidents of other colleges, the community, and college students. As with the regular hosting of District committees, the frequent hosting of the Board meetings led to more firsthand engagement with and knowledge of information relevant to all nine colleges in the LACCD.

**Analysis of Results Achieved:**

It was clear to the college that district/college communication and flow of information needed improvement. The District/College Communication webpage was developed as an appropriate and inclusive repository for all campus constituencies to easily access information. The web pages provide campus personnel with their representatives on district committees and with links to agendas and minutes so information is easily collected from and directed to the district. The framework for expanding LATTC’s communication model including lists of campus representatives along with clear signposts for the flow of information from the district to the campus has been effective. Critical information affecting the governance of the college now emanates from the district committees and their meetings. There are now college representatives on virtually all district-wide committees, and college constituencies can quickly identify these representatives on those committees. It is the responsibility of district committees to distribute information in a timely and widespread basis; thus, the coordinated efforts between the campus and district in response to this recommendation have led to improved communication between the district and all nine of its colleges.

**Additional Plans:**

There will be an ongoing awareness campaign to direct the campus community to the common access point of the District/College Communication web page on the college website. It remains the best resource for campus constituents for updated information, policies, and procedures.

Added to the District/College Communication web page on the college website will be a “blog” which allows anyone on the college campus to post questions or comments for both the college and district representative. The webpage along with the blog feature will be critical in continuing to develop a culture of communication that includes unfiltered inquiries and comprehensive, timely responses. Having this site will help improve an ongoing and sustainable communication environment for committees, representatives and constituents.

The LATTC Public Relations Manager attends periodic meetings with LACCD campus public relations managers, contracted bond measure public relations firms, and district personnel to gather more detailed information about issues facing the district that have a direct relationship to one or more campuses and their constituents. Reports of information related to district communication will be published in the Accreditation Newsletter so the entire campus and all constituents will have access to the information. These newsletters will have a left-side navigation link on the District/College Communication webpage (V.5).
The LACCD has additional plans in response to this recommendation which compliment LATTC’s efforts as well as enhance communication between and amongst all campuses. The District IT Office is establishing new Institutional Effectiveness web pages which will be accessed through a new link – titled District Level Governance Committees—on the District Office home page. All agendas and minutes are being moved from the intranet and other locations on the District website so they are accessible from the home page. Each committee page will contain a link with the date, time, and location of meetings, a link to access the agendas and minutes for the last 12 months, and a link for archived agendas and minutes. The test site is scheduled to be up the first week in March for District faculty, students, and staff to view and provide feedback regarding its redesigned look and feel. At the end of March, it should be ready to go live.

In addition, District IT staff is designing an LACCD 411 page to post the latest action items and motions passed in each district committee so that constituents do not need to read the complete minutes to get this important information.

District IT has begun internal piloting of a SharePoint information system allowing chairs of appropriate district committees to post minutes themselves and enabling college constituents to subscribe to automatically receive emails from district committees (“push reporting”). The system will be piloted to the public in summer 2011 and is expected to be ready for a fall 2011 rollout.

Similar to the blog feature being designed for the college website, in spring 2011, District IT will pilot a system that will allow college constituents to comment and provide feedback on documents, such as plans and proposals, posted by district committees.

The District will also be conducting a search for a Director of Communications and External Affairs whose job duties will include public relations and communication with the colleges. The Director will also have responsibility for working with the IT Department to restructure the District Office website. His/her expected start date is May of 2011.
### Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.1</th>
<th>Board of Trustees August 11, 2010 Meeting Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V.2 | District Institutional Effectiveness Committee Web Page with Meeting Minutes  
      District Curriculum Committee Web Page with Meeting Minutes  
      District Student Success Committee Web Page with Meeting Minutes  
      District-level Governance Committee February 16, 2011 Meeting Minutes |
| V.3 | Board of Trustees Committee of the Whole Web Page with Meeting Minutes |
| V.4 | Agendas of Board of Trustees Committee of the Whole Meetings hosted at LATTC |
| V.5 | LACCD District Home Page |