

Las Positas College

Accreditation Midterm Report

Submitted to the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2010

Insert Logo Here

3000 Campus Hill Drive

Livermore, CA 94551

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certification of Las Positas College Midterm Report 2

Statement on Report Preparation3

Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter4

Recommendation 1 A

Recommendation 1 B

Recommendation 2

Recommendation 3 A

Recommendation 3 B

Recommendation 4

Recommendation 5

College/District Recommendation 1

College/District Recommendation 2

Response to Self-Identified issues (Improvement Plans)

Appendices

CERTIFICATION OF LAS POSITAS COLLEGE MIDTERM REPORT

Date:

To: Accrediting Commission for community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Las Positas College
3000 Campus Hill Drive
Livermore, CA 94551

This Midterm Report certifies there was broad participation by the campus community and that the Midterm Report accurately responds to the Accrediting Commission's recommendations.

Signed,

Interim Chancellor, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

Isobel Dvorsky, President, Board of Trustees, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

Dr. Kevin Walthers, President, Las Positas College

Ms. Sarah Thompson, President, Las Positas College Academic Senate

Mr. Todd Steffans, President, Las Positas College Classified Senate

President, Associated Students of Las Positas College

STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

The Las Positas College Self-Study Report was completed and submitted to the Accrediting Commission for community and Junior colleges (ACCJC) for its site visit that occurred October 19 – 22, 2009.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges at its meeting on January 6 – 8, 2010 took action to reaffirm accreditation for Las Positas College, with the requirement that the College complete a Follow Up Report by October 15, 2010. The Commission required that the Follow Up Report demonstrate resolution of College Recommendation 3 and College Recommendation 4.

A Follow Up Report was completed and submitted to ACCJC in October 2010 that addressed Recommendation 3 A, 3 B, and 4.

This submission of the Midterm Report provides updated status of all Recommendations cited by the Commission during October 19 – 22, 2009 visit. The following narrative describes the process used to prepare this report and identifies those who were involved in its preparation.

During the Fall semester 2011, Accreditation teams were identified for each College and College/District recommendation. Each team consisted of representatives from all constituency groups on campus as well as representative as relevant from the District Office and Chabot College. Team members were selected based on their involvement in various governance activities throughout the college and district. For example, team leaders for the Recommendation 2 related to student learning outcomes and integrated planning included members of the Student Learning Outcomes Committee. Most members came to the Recommendation Teams with history and experience in the specific topic to be addressed.

Teams were provided a template that included the Recommendation to which each was to respond, a section for narrative regarding progress made toward compliance with the accreditation standard, analysis of that progress, and recommended examples of evidence designed to support claims of progress made since the Accreditation site visit. During spring 2012 semester, teams met at least monthly to determine progress made, analyze the progress, select evidence, and document their findings on the template. In May 2012, documents were collected by the Vice President of Academic Services for review and preparation for the author of the draft of the 2012 Midterm Report.

During summer 2012, Ms. Sarah Thompson, President of the Academic Senate authored the report, providing drafts to the Vice President of Academic Services for review. Upon completion of Midterm Report content, the Report was shared with the entire Las Positas College community on an electronic drive for review, feedback, and comments. This occurred during the month of September 2012. Concurrently, the document was provided to College Council and the Academic Senate for feedback which was incorporated prior to submission to

the Board of Trustees for review and approval. The following list identifies the members of the Recommendation teams:

Recommendation 1. A. Institutional Effectiveness

Team Leader: Bob Kratochvil

Team: Bob Kratochvil (Chair, Institutional Effectiveness committee)
Rajinder Samra – Institutional Research
Nan Ho – Faculty
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Recommendation 1B. Program Review, Planning and Governance Systems

Team Leader: Melissa Korber/Sarah Thompson

Team: Elena Cole, Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Sarah Thompson/Melissa Korber – Faculty
Rajinder Samra – Institutional Research
Janice Noble/VP Academic Services
Bob Kratochvil/VP Business Services
Jeff Baker/Interim VP Student Services
Todd Steffan - Classified
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Recommendation 2. Student Learning Outcomes

Team Leader: Richard Grow

Team: Richard Grow (SLO Committee Chair – Faculty)
Elena Cole – Faculty
Elizabeth Hopkins – Faculty
Janice Noble/VP Academic Services
Scott Vigallon – Classified
Amir Salazadeh – Student

Recommendation 3. A. Program Review (Update from October 2010 Follow-Up Report)

Team Leader: Elena Cole

Team: Bob Kratochvil (Chair, Institutional Effectiveness Committee)
Rajinder Samra (Institutional Research)
Nan Ho – Faculty
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Elena Cole – Faculty
Teri Henson – Faculty
Richard Grow – Faculty
Scott Vigallon
Jeff Baker

Recommendation 3.B. Administrative Program Review (Update from October 2010 Follow-Up Report)

Team Leader: Melissa Korber/Sarah Thompson

Team: Elena Cole, Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Teri Henson (Co Chair Program Review Committee)
Sarah Thompson/Melissa Korber – Faculty
Rajinder Samra
Janice Noble/VP Academic Services
Todd Steffan – Classified
Jennifer Adams – Classified Confidential

Recommendation 4. Information Competency (Update from October 2010 Follow-Up Report)

Team Leader: Cheryl Warren

Team: Cheryl Warren – Faculty/Librarian
All librarians
Robin Roy – Faculty
Elizabeth Hopkins – Faculty
Maureen O’ Herin – Faculty
Steve Gunderson – Classified

Recommendation 5. Ethics Code (Develop a written code of professional ethics for all personnel)

Team Leader: Janice Noble

District-wide Administrator Association
Jane McCoy – Faculty
LaVaughn Hart – Faculty
Greg Daubenmire – Faculty
Todd Stephen – Classified
Bill Eddy – Classified

DISTRICT AND COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 1. District/College Functions and Services

Team Leader: Kevin Walthers

Team: Bob D'Elena – Faculty
Kevin Walthers – President
Heidi Ulrech – Classified
Justin Garoupa – Faculty
John Gonder – Faculty
District Appointee
Chabot Appointee

DISTRICT AND COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 2. Resource Allocation Process

Team leader: Sarah Thompson

Team: Janice Noble/VP Academic Services LPC
George Railey/ VP Academic Services Chabot
Sarah Thompson, Academic Senate President LPC – Faculty
Kathy Kelley, Academic Senate President Chabot – Faculty
Lorenzo Legaspi – Vice Chancellor, Business Services

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2009 Visiting Team

Team Recommendations:

As a result of the October 2009 visit, the team made seven recommendations:

Recommendation #1

Institutional Effectiveness

To improve to a level of sustained continuous quality improvement the team recommends that:

- A. The college increase its capacity for conducting research, fulfill its planning agenda with respect to institutional research and institutional effectiveness, and integrate institutional effectiveness research into planning through regular systemic evaluation of its progress toward achieving institutional goals. (I.B.3, I.B.4)
- B. The college develop and implement on-going, systematic, college-wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its program review, planning and governance systems. (I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.5)

Progress Made – Recommendation 1A:

Capacity for Research

Despite facing the same budgetary challenges of every California Community College, Las Positas College (LPC) has been able to increase our research capacity. As a priority for the new President, this has been accomplished with a new researcher whose emphasis is solely on providing research data to faculty and staff. The primary reasons for our dramatic improvement in increasing our capacity are:

1. Hiring a Director of Research whose skill set matches the needs of the institution. He has vast experience in conducting research projects and has been able to generate our data and explain it in a manner that tells a clear “story” about our college. In his first semester he more than doubled the output of research inquiries for faculty and produced more than four times the prior year’s research projects during his first year. The Director continued to improve his output by hiring a skilled grant funded assistant to increase the ability to meet current research needs.
2. Involving the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff in data gathering processes and sharing data with the staff so that the TLC staff is familiar with the information generated from the data and can in turn share the information with the faculty and staff during training sessions. The TLC staff members have assisted faculty and the Director of Research by supporting those who wish to develop surveys through the use of Survey Monkey and Google Survey to collect and analyze the data in order to conduct their own research.

3. Providing multiple training opportunities for faculty on how to initiate, and conduct his/her research. In addition to the support and learning opportunities offered to the faculty by the TLC, the Academic Senate, the Instructional Program Review Committee, and Staff Development Committee have hosted several Flex Days over the past two years to educate faculty on the types of data available, how to request data for specific projects, how to conduct original research, and specifically how to assess program level data.

Planning Agenda for Institutional Effectiveness

In 2009 – 2010 academic year, LPC created an overarching strategic planning/institutional effectiveness program review model slated for implementation in 2010 – 2011 academic year. The model demonstrates the effectiveness of the college's ability to collaborate with different constituency groups and support the college's overall improvement. Most of the challenges from the new model fall into five categories.

1. The number of goals established for the college. Ten goals were established for the college and were the outcome of inspirational thinking. Discussions have ensued in several committees including College Council and Institutional Effectiveness Committee for the need to streamline and take a more practical and realistic approach to goal setting for the college. With new emphasis in the past two years on student success, goals must include this very important topic.
2. Prioritized goals for action. There is only one goal for the college that emphasizes teaching and learning. The remaining goals have not been prioritized for implementation and many are qualitative in nature and difficult to measure for success.
3. A strategic planning process designed to meet internal time frames. Initially the Strategic Planning process included three steps: gather college-wide input; vet ideas/strategies about how to meet each goal; and share the outcome of the expert committees with the college community to focus our efforts for the college's next five years. Due to administrative turnover, the second step did not take place and the Strategic Plan was published with more than 100 Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for the college to implement.
4. Implementation of a large number of Key Performance Indicators (KPI). The newly formed Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) was charged with tracking and monitoring the progress of these college-wide indicators. The task was daunting with too much data and far too much to track for the committee to be effective in its work. In addition, accreditation standards and state compliance issues were not included in the initial draft and were integrated after publication.

5. Processes required of committees were not fully developed and implemented within the current structure of the committees. Three committees were identified as the main oversight bodies for the new integrated planning and institutional effectiveness model. Each was assigned a role for the processes. College Council was to set goals for the institution; Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) was to implement spending priorities based on goals developed by college council; and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the processes was assigned to Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). While an effective division of labor, these assignments did not fully reflect the manner in which each committee operated at the time. The intention was to review and revise the charge for each committee over the ensuing years.

When the new set of expectations for the committee was developed and moved to implementation, College Council had been defined as primarily an informative committee for the College President. All constituency leaders and key committee chair persons attended College Council to exchange information and coordinate college-wide projects. An example of a project is the Governance Handbook that over the course of three years was approved through all constituency groups despite multiple changes in administration leadership. In hindsight, this committee was not the best choice to assign planning tasks. In 2010, College Council recommended that Institutional Effectiveness Committee be tasked with goal setting as a result of their evaluation process outcomes.

The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) has as its primary function funds allocation for Instructional Equipment, and prioritization of the institution's needs for non-instructional personnel, e.g. classified and administrative staff. Over the past three years, the committee membership has become more closely aligned with the district and college budget challenges. PBC members that are not part of the District Budget Study Group (DBSG) receive reports from this district based committee through those members on both committees. PBC has not been tasked with planning activities for the college. Other fund allocation committees on campus include Faculty Prioritization, Basic Skills, and Staff Development committees. Members of these committees do not have membership on the PBC so the task of prioritization of funds is a complex process.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee is the College's newest committee. Formed two years ago, it is finding its way with the support of the increased capacity provided by institutional research data. The maturing process of this committee is occurring as more data are available for analysis and decision-making. Recommendations at the year-end meeting include review of the number of college-wide goals needed to achieve success; adhere to all steps in order to assure broad support from constituency groups during

planning processes; and incorporate student success measures into evaluation processes.

Integrating institutional effectiveness research into planning through regular systematic evaluation

Las Positas College has seen great success with the integration of research into planning through regular systematic evaluation at the instructional and non-instructional program level. Programs have used Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and completion data to initiate curricular changes. Most notable is the success the Writing Program's analysis of learning/completion outcomes of accelerated versus non-accelerated courses. Findings reveal no significant statistical difference in success rates. Since accelerated courses support student completion and matriculation, the Writing Program increased the number of accelerated course offerings.

As the Institutional Effectiveness Committee continues to mature in its ability to integrate research findings into planning, LPC will find an increasing number of opportunities to use data-driven decisions to improve planning and foster student success and completion.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 1A

Capacity for Research

LPC is confident we have met the requirement of Recommendation 1A through the support of college leadership from all constituency groups taking intentional and deliberate actions. Through the dedicated actions of a new Director of Research, his assistant, and staff from the Teaching and Learning Center, the capacity for meaningful research that supports the mission of the college has been increased and is now fostering the training of "champions" to support others as they begin the journey of research-based program planning.

Planning Agenda for Institutional Effectiveness

As described above, the institutional model initiated in 2009 was implemented with modest success due in part with multiple changes in campus leadership that required time to understand and support the manner in which the college functioned. This reality has hampered the college's ability to move forward as rapidly as anticipated in 2009.

Las Positas College may also be victims of our own college culture. We have a culture of respect and autonomy and generally allow committees to function independently, assuming those in committee and constituency leadership roles know their duties and responsibilities best. However, since we are working toward changing our practices to link assessment to

planning and outcomes with evaluation, this tradition of independence may not serve us well at this moment in our college's development.

The college's operational structure regarding research may not be aligned in the most effective manner. Discussion has ensued to develop two separate entities – Planning and Research. These entities would be interconnected but be able to work effectively to support the research needs and the planning processes that support student learning. A Director of Planning would help integrate planning and allocation committees and ensure college priorities are communicated and implemented.

LPC goals are:

1. Review, and revise if needed, the college mission and vision statements and streamline and reformulate college goals. A formal request by Academic Senate has been made to begin this process and the administrative team has currently submitted a proposal to move the college forward in this endeavor.
2. Revisit the college's strategic goals to ensure they are aligned with student learning outcomes and completion expectations. The current strategic plan is a testimony to the college community's ability to work collaboratively; however, the sheer volume of action items is an unwieldy tool for planning and achievement.
3. Reevaluate the Institutional Effectiveness model taking into account the progress made and the successes accomplished at the program level. This process will consider areas for improvement such as the assignment of roles to committees not designed to function in those capacities. While the college is loathed to begin another committee while we are downsizing our faculty, staff, and administrators, it is willing to do so as an essential step toward accomplishing our institutional goals and improvement plans.

LPC believes that after working with the existing model and making revisions to it as well as implementing the planned review and revision processes in 2012 for the college's mission, goals, and strategic plan, we have successfully met the requirements of this part of the accreditation standard.

Evidence

- 1) Capacity for Research
 - a. Spreadsheet of projects over the past few years (Rajinder says he has this)
 - b. SLO analysis program reviews and updates – where can we get this?
 - c. Flex day/ TLC workshop agendas
- 2) Fulfill its planning agenda with respect to institutional research

- a. Goals, Vision and Mission statements
 - b. Original minutes and models from the Common Ground Committee
 - c. Revamped model from Trifecta last year
 - d. Strategic Plan
 - e. IE minutes with discussions of challenges with KPIs highlighted
 - f. Minutes from PBC and College Council with discussion re: IE role highlighted
- 3) Integrate Institutional Effectiveness Research into Planning
- a. The English department's meeting minutes – the schedule of course offerings before and after before and after
 - b. English department's program review

DRAFT

Progress Made – Recommendation 1B:

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of program review

Prior to our 2009 Accreditation site visit, our Program Review Committee was an ad-hoc Academic Senate Committee. The Committee is now a fully sanctioned standing Academic Senate Committee with contractually assured reassigned time for its chair(s). The college's program review process has also expanded to include all Non-Instructional areas e.g. Division Offices, President's Office, and Student Services. While the Instructional Program Review Committee is freestanding from the areas of Non-Instruction and Student Services, discussion have begun this year to see if the college might be better served by an all encompassing Program Review Committee, as all three areas now conduct program reviews.

Our last Program Review Full Report Cycle began in 2010 – it was all inclusive (all instructional, non-instructional and student service programs participated). This meant a great deal of work for Program Review Committee Members, but the college wanted full program updates and universal feedback from all sectors. There were numerous workshops and online help for faculty and staff to complete their first draft of the Program Review. Program Review mentors read each document and provided feedback and recommended additions and changes to the authors. Once the authors believed the document was an accurate reflection of their program's history, current status, and goals, each author was asked to complete a summary document indicating the program's maintenance and development needs. This document is known as "The Common Tool". The Common Tool identifies the fiscal and non-fiscal needs of each program. It is a method used to evaluate the college needs as a whole. For example, it could answer the question, "How many programs need a new or replacement Classified position? Or "How many programs need to update their Course Outlines of Record to current Title V standards"?

In the Spring of 2011 the Program Review Committee sent out a survey to faculty soliciting feedback on the new process. In general, faculty appreciated the template, but overwhelmingly stated a need for greater access to data. The Committee and the previous Director of Research outlined a plan to meet this need through automating more general course level data. The Committee also identified a need to train faculty in how to gather targeted data themselves. Solutions, many outlined in the response to Recommendation 1A, have been successfully implemented.

In Spring 2011, a Flex Day was set aside to update Program Reviews, primarily to capture changes in data, and guide faculty further in assessment of their Student Learning Outcomes. Currently we are planning a research project to compare the level of data assessment of the original Program Reviews and the updated Program Reviews to see if practices are changing as a consequence of the training faculty have received.

In Fall 2011 the various allocation committees on campus (Faculty Hiring Prioritization, Planning and Budget, Staff Development, etc.) evaluated their application forms and amended them to make Program Review data the central consideration for funding. Some committees required the entire Program Review in addition to their application/request form, while others required critical parts of program Review and included those in the application itself. These committees, in turn, gave feedback to the Program Review Committee as to the effectiveness of the information and format of the current Program Review document, with the goal of having the process so efficient and streamlined that eventually the Program Review document itself would become the “application” for different forms of funding.

The biggest challenge our Program Review Process is facing is how to validate the Program Review content requests for new faculty, equipment, facilities, etc. Since there are fewer non-Instructional and Student Services Program Reviews, administrators in these areas are able to provide validation for these documents. A challenge to the process is the number of instructional programs, and too few administrators and faculty familiar with various subjects to serve as a check and balance system in this part of the process. At the beginning of 2012, the Program Review Committee took the issue of validation on, culminating in a proposal submitted to the Academic Senate and College Council. This proposal identified the College Council as the validation committee. The proposal is currently under consideration by the College Council.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of planning

In Spring 2010, our Director of Research conducted a college wide survey to understand how knowledgeable our college community was about our strategic planning process. In addition, general questions were asked about the effectiveness of our strategic planning process. The responses revealed that less than half of our community agreed that they understood our college goals or strategic plan. Yet, despite this, many understood that our strategic plan was linked to our program planning. The results of this survey were not run until early 2011, and no action was taken to respond to this survey.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of governance

We currently survey staff every 6 years to assess our governance systems, with the next survey scheduled in 2013. The Director of Research plans to work with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to increase the frequency of these surveys to a more meaningful timeframe. This decision is the result of the new emphasis on meaningful research.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 1B

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of program review

Overall, we have done well with our assessment of Program Review. LPC community is proud of and grateful for a very dedicated Program Review committee and its leadership. Over the past few years the committee membership has solicited and received feedback, and has responded with diligence to its constituents. We believe we have successfully met the requirements of this recommendation.

The challenge faced today is how to accurately validate the requests that emerge from the Program Review Process. Until we have a method for this, it will be difficult to truly integrate Instructional Program Review into institutional level planning. Some funding committees feel ill-at-ease using program reviews as the basis for allocation, as they feel inadequate to judge the validity of the needs of fellow faculty, staff members, etc. Greater trust could be generated by a process that takes away that doubt.

In Recommendation 1A it was stated that there is a need for a Director of Planning to integrate strategic planning, allocation, and accreditation. The Director could also oversee the validation process for Program Reviews.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of planning

The administrative turnover has led to frequent reprioritization of tasks. The current campus leadership took proactive steps to establish a systematic sustainable process. We are fortunate to have a Director of Research who has been able to complete projects from past years. It will

likely mean some of the data that has been collected in the past two to three years is outdated and will need to be re-gathered for a meaningful response to be implemented.

Implementation of ongoing, systematic, college wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of governance

Strong support will be given to increasing the frequency of reliable and valid staff surveys to determine the effectiveness of the governance processes currently in place.

LPC goals are:

1. Design and implement a valid and reliable method of assuring that all Program Review requests reflect the true needs of each program and non-instructional sector
2. Re-evaluate existing staff survey data to determine its relevance to the current college community environment
3. Increase the frequency with which the governance effectiveness survey data is collected
4. Continue to increase the staff development and education for the college community related to research design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation, and implementation of program improvements

Evidence

Program Review charge (from Governance handbook)

Program Review Templates – instructional, non-instructional, student services

Sample of each Program Review

Sample feedback sheets – mentors

Common Tool Template

Sample common tool forms – maintenance and development

Common Tool spreadsheet

Results – faculty survey 2011

Applications from Faculty Prioritization, Staff Development, PBC

Feedback sheets from committees

Validation proposal from Program Review

Results – staff survey on strategic planning

Recommendation #2

Student Learning Outcomes

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, and to achieve a level of proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes, the team recommends that the college fully engage both full time and adjunct faculty in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, and establish and achieve institutional timelines for completing student learning outcomes assessments for all its courses, programs and services. Emphasis should be placed on encouraging institutional dialog about assessment results, rather than dialog about the Student Learning Outcome Assessment process. The institution should focus on the use of assessment results for quality assurance and improvement of educational programming to improve student learning, as well as inform planning and resource allocation decisions.

Progress Made – Recommendation 2:

Engaging both full time and part time faculty in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Significant progress has been made this past year in the creation and measurement of Student Learning Outcomes. This was largely facilitated by the contractual agreement to compensate adjuncts to participate in the SLO process. In January of 2012, 74% of courses had SLOs – by May, the SLO rate was at 92%. SLO assessment documentation also jumped during the same time period. In January, 49% of course-level Student Learning Outcomes were being assessed and by May that had risen to 61%. This number is even more significant when one considers that due to work load reduction, some of our courses were not offered in the past year; therefore, assessments could not be completed.

The increase in recording and assessment of SLOs also reflected improvements made to our software system by our Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff. Faculty have registered concerns over the years that our SLO management system, eLumen, was not user-friendly and limited in its ability to analyze data. The TLC staff worked with the eLumen vendor to make the software more accessible. The TLC staff also create web forms which would allow instructors to avoid the software interaction altogether.

Establish and achieve institutional timelines for completing student learning outcomes assessment for all courses, programs, and services

In December 2011, the Student Learning Outcome Committee announced the goal of having 100% course level SLO compliance by the end of the academic year. Although the college did not quite reach this goal, excellent progress was made through this endeavor. Having worked diligently to come to proficiency on the course SLO level, we are still in the development stage for the creation and assessment of Program Level SLOs. Currently, 53% of programs have defined SLOs, and 31% of all programs are actively assessing their SLOs. Some non-instructional programs are struggling with the measurability of their SLOs, and are currently in dialogue about how best to redefine the SLOs based on desired student learning.

Encourage dialog about assessment results rather than process

In 2010, the college identified Program Review as our primary process for evaluation of SLOs. Over the past two years, SLO data became more embedded into the Program Review process, with Program Review updates emphasizing SLO analysis. The Spring 2012 Faculty Flex Day was used exclusively as an “Assessment Day”, with poster sessions from Business, Math, and English as models of SLO measurement, assessment, implementation, and reassessment. The College found that having Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes as two distinctly separate committees has not been effective. In 2010, the meeting times were changed so they could collaborate more easily. Ultimately, the goal is to merge the committees into a ‘Program Assessment’ Committee. This action is planned to be completed in the 2013 – 14 academic year.

Use assessment results to improve student learning

Business, Math, and English have been identified as the model programs for implementing curricular changes in response to SLO assessment. Data are now more readily available to support the identification of how many of our programs, Degrees, or Certificates are actively using SLO data in their curricular planning.

Use assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation decisions

In 2011-2012, allocation committees across campus have either continued or begun to require SLO assessment in their application process and forms. Most allocation committees currently require that requests be rooted in the discipline/program’s Program Review document. The Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes committees have also made a general request to allocating committees that they not only require SLOs as a foundation for funding, but also engage in follow up evaluation the following year as to the impact of the funding on student learning outcomes.

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) planning consultant, gkkWorks, used current Program Review documents as the basis to compile the current draft of the District and individual College Educational Master Plan. While the Consultants did not specifically use SLOs to create the draft Educational Master Plan, the SLOs were embedded in the Program Review process and documents supplied to the consultants.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 2:

Engaging both full time and part time faculty in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Providing compensation for adjunct faculty to participate in SLO assessment was a major achievement as a result of the most recent Faculty Association contract negotiations. This next year should see even more significant improvement in both measurement and assessment of course level SLOs. The SLO and Program Review Committees have identified their goal in 2012-2013 to improve the mapping process for course and program level SLOs to our Institutional Core Competencies. The SLO management system, eLumen requires users to designate which core competency the SLO is mapped to upon entering a new outcome for assessment.

One challenge faced with faculty participation is internalizing the value of Student Learning Outcomes as a mechanism for continuous improvement. There is still reluctance on the part of many faculty members to fully engage in the SLO process. Most comply out of a sense of obligation, but campus leadership struggles to help programs find meaningful outcomes of their assessments. We have discovered that our SLO management system, eLumen, has also fed into this issue by being somewhat limiting in what it can effectively assess. The SLO Committee has allowed faculty to create their own rubric, but this rubric offers a limited structure; the score options are a 0-4 scale. The College must expand our outreach education to faculty to foster creative alternatives to the eLumen model so SLOs become an internalized and valued part of the student learning and faculty teaching process.

The same reluctance is not apparent in Student Services or Non-Instructional personnel, but it may be because they have only recently created their outcome objectives. Student Services faculty and staff have discovered that the SLOs initially developed are not easily quantifiable, so they are re-evaluating their set of outcomes to transform them into Service Area Outcomes (SAO).

Establish and achieve institutional timelines for completing student learning outcomes assessment for all courses, programs, and services

The goal of 100% compliance for all courses, degrees, and certificate for the 2011-2012 academic year was successful at 92%, and demonstrated significant improvement. Similar goals need to be set each year, and these goals need to be incorporated and validated by our fund allocation sources consistently. Through various venues, intentional and deliberate steps were taken to engage faculty to gain their support in the development, implementation, and assessment processes for documenting Student Learning Outcomes.

Encourage dialog about assessment results rather than process

The success demonstrated by Business, Math, and English is serving as an encouraging model for other disciplines. **(Insert the results of the Program Review update here)**

Use assessment results to improve student learning

Combining Program Review Committee and SLO Committee work is probably the most effective way we can identify programs that need additional support to better implement curricular changes. We have found it critical that SLO Committee members evaluate the assessment of SLOs in the Program Reviews, as those SLO Committee member experts are better able to validate the effectiveness of those assessments than are the Program Review Committee counterparts.

Use assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation decisions

A challenge to validating SLO work is no consequences result from not doing effective SLO development, implementation, and assessment. Some allocating committees require an SLO analysis and support of their request, while others do not. For example, the Las Positas College Foundation does not require SLO results to support a request for funding. Many assume that since SLOs are embedded in Program Review documents, that they are indirectly included in requests for funds. Yet, since the level of sophistication in using assessment data to allocate resources based on this data has not matured to the degree desired, it is not valid to state SLO assessments wholly inform planning and resource allocation. While the college wants to avoid duplication of work (e.g. have forms which require program review and SLO assessment), it may be necessary until we perfect the SLO analysis in our program reviews. The intention is to replicate the successes experienced in those allocation committees to the entire campus.

LPC goals are:

1. Promote internalization of the value of student learning outcomes in the teaching and learning process and planning and allocation processes.
2. Begin evaluation of fund allocation impact on future student learning outcomes.
3. Continue actively pursuing 100 % compliance with course, degree, and certificate SLOs.

Evidence:

- 1) Teaching and Learning Center Data on SLO Progress
- 2) eLumen web form
- 3) Spring 2012 Town Hall Reports
- 4) Outcomes of Program Review Update of Spring 2012
- 5) Poster sessions – Business, Math, English
- 6) Allocation forms from committees that do use SLO data – e.g. PBC Instructional equipment
- 7) Request from Program Review re: follow up questions
- 8) Draft Educational Master Plan

Recommendation #3

Program Review

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:

- A. The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning. (I.B.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)
- B. The college fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services. (I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.D.3)

Progress Made – Recommendation 3A:

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review

As described in the *Accreditation Follow-Up Report*, submitted October 2010, the college revised the program review self-study to capture evidence of programs' assessments of student learning. All instructional programs at Las Positas College completed program review in Fall 2010. The newly formed Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) evaluated the program reviews. The evaluation process involved IPRC members offering feedback to the authors about the strength of the data and information provided, including each program's assessment of student learning outcomes. The defined process was followed; however, some members were uncomfortable commenting on the quality of SLO work done by the different disciplines. The IPRC met with the Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLOC) in a meeting in March 2011 to discuss programs' progress on SLOs to date and strategize ways to support further progress.

In Fall 2011, the IPRC and the SLO Committee held several joint meetings to develop an annual program review update form which focused on capturing programs' SLO work, particularly identifying ways each program serves students. In addition, the IPRC and the SLOC, working together as is stated in the IPRC's charge, also supported the efforts of the Staff Development Committee to plan the March 29, 2012 flex day. The flex day activities required participants to engage in dialogue about their SLO work through the vehicle of poster sessions, and examine the role of LPC's Core Competencies in relation to student transcripts.

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for planning

Las Positas College has worked with intention and commitment to integrate program review into planning. (See Response to Recommendation 1A). In the 2010-2011 academic year, the Director of Research and Planning, along with the IPRC, developed the "Common Tool". This

document was envisioned to be the method the college used to develop a long term planning process. The Common Tool is a spreadsheet snapshot of needs compiled from all program review documents – Instructional, Non-Instructional and Student Services sectors. The Common Tool was divided into two different types of needs: Those required to maintain the program, and those required to develop the program.

Despite the complexity of the Common Tool, there were some weaknesses in this model that were detected. First, since there is no process for validating the content of the program review (no process to see if the data merited the needs requests), all items on maintenance and development forms were included in the spreadsheet. Second, the lack of ability to validate the requests with data, made prioritization of needs difficult. The Director of Research spent several weeks compiling the Common Tool and when complete, it was cumbersome to use as a tool for college planning.

We have been more successful in integrating program review into the various allocation processes at the college. Most allocating committees use some element of program review in the application process. Two allocation committees, Faculty Prioritization and Staff Development, require the entire program review be submitted with a request for resources. Yet, without any form of institutional prioritization, allocating committees are left with judging the quality of program reviews based on their authors' ability to write and provide statistical supporting data rather than funding toward specific college goals.

This issue in the process was addressed in the "Program Review Roundtable" held in January 2012. Faculty and Administrators gathered to discuss the effectiveness of the current Program Review Model and how it integrated into the overall planning and resource allocation process. As a result of the discussions at the roundtable, the IPRC presented a new model for integrating Program Review into the Institutional Effectiveness Model to the College Council in Spring 2012.

This proposed model differs from the original model developed by the Common Ground Committee of 2010 (the creators of the original Institutional Effectiveness model) in several ways. First, the group identified College Council as the lead in reading program reviews and setting institutional priorities. Second, College Council is to be the committee responsible for communicating these college priorities to all allocating committees. Third, Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) is removed from the process. Fourth, a new committee of Deans and IPRC members is to be created to validate the program reviews before they are viewed by the College Council, and finally, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) evaluates the entire process.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 3A:

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review

As outlined in the response to Recommendation 2, our SLO assessment has significantly increased since 2009. Integrating SLOs assessment data and analysis into the program review process greatly contributed to this achievement. The challenge still before the college is evaluating the effectiveness and validity of the SLOs data. Since it is the IPRC's responsibility to read Program Reviews, the SLO Committee membership is not formally involved in the evaluation of SLOs used in Program Reviews. An effective process for SLO evaluation requires both committees to collaborate. It is planned that these two committees will merge in the next academic year, making this piece of the process more effective.

The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for planning

The Common Tool remains a good concept, but the program reviews need thorough vetting prior to their requests being placed in the document. It would help, as well, to have projections built into the Program Review/Common Tool process. Currently there was no timeline for when development resources were needed – next year, next month, or tomorrow. This problem reveals yet again the need for a validation step in our program review process. The college-wide process would require more depth and understanding of individual program to use this process for effective planning for resources allocation.

The Institutional Effectiveness model developed by the IPRC reflects this need. Yet, there are challenges to their recommendations as well. As outlined in Recommendation 1A, College Council serves mostly as an information exchange. Taking on the broad responsibility of reading programs review documents and conducting the rich discussion required to integrate the outcomes of program review, accreditation needs, and state mandates in the framework of our college goals is a major shift of responsibilities for this committee.

In addition, with recent budget cuts, the college has reduced administrative staff from 6 deans to 4 (3 academic, 1 student services). Work load for administrators has exponentially increased over the past year. The college no longer has a dean of Counseling and Matriculation and the Vice President of Student Services serves in that capacity. It remains to be seen if this group will be able to serve as a validation team with the IPRC representatives.

A Director of Planning as outlined in the response to Recommendation 1A would significantly streamline and solidify the validation and evaluation of effectiveness for this process. This administrator would take the lead in facilitating the Planning Committee and the Program Review Validation team. These committees would then be integrated into the IPRC's Institutional Effectiveness model.

Evidence:

- i. Accreditation Follow Up Report of 2010
- ii. Instructional Program Review Self Study – Fall 2009-2010

- iii. Several examples of the self study
- iv. Example of Feedback from Program Review evaluation
- v. Agenda and minutes from joint SLO/Program Review committee meetings
- vi. Program Review update form 2012
- vii. March 29 Flex Day agenda
- viii. Examples of English, Math and Business Poster Sessions
- ix. Response to Recommendation 1A
- x. Common Tool
- xi. Form for Program Maintenance
- xii. Form for Program Development
- xiii. District Education and Facilities Master Plan
- xiv. Faculty Prioritization and Staff Development request forms
- xv. Program Review Roundtable Agenda and Minutes
- xvi. Program Review's IE Model
- xvii. Response to Recommendation 2

Recommendation #3

Program Review

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that:

- A. The college fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning. (I.B.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)
- B. The college fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services. (I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.D.3)

Progress Made – Recommendation 3B:

The College Fully Implement a Program Review Process for All Administrative Programs and Services

As described in the *Accreditation Follow-Up Report*, submitted October 2010, the college implemented its first program reviews for non-instructional and student services areas. All programs reviews have been completed and updated. The original structure using Instructional Program Review as a separate process has created some challenges. An area that is being worked on through collaboration is connecting program requests from all sectors into the Common Tool for updates, planning models, mentoring, etc. Having separate groups assess the different areas of Program Review document has created additional work for Program Review coordinators.

Non-instructional Program Review has completed one cycle and these documents have been reviewed by the Vice President of the sector and are housed with Institutional Research. Each non-instructional program review was also required to submit Program Development and Maintenance forms and add their requests to the Common Tool. This information on the Common Tool was distributed to several key committees throughout the college governance structure as a document to aid in hiring decisions, resource allocation, and planning.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 3 B:

The College Fully Implement a Program Review Process for All Administrative Programs and Services

The college has made significant progress in this area and believes it has successfully met the Accreditation standard. Discussions are now underway about how to integrate Student Services and Non-Instructional Program Review into the Instructional Program Review Committee. The Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) currently serves as an Academic Senate Sub-Committee, and has been successful in the past in developing lines of communication/reporting

structures in these instances (for example, our Staff Development Committee is not an Academic Senate Subcommittee as they service the entire campus's staff development).

Evidence:

- 1) Accreditation Follow Up Report
- 2) Examples – non-instructional and student services program reviews
- 3) Common Tool
- 4) Minutes – College Council re: Staff Development
- 5) Agenda/Minutes Fall 2012 Program Review Meeting – September 12

DRAFT

Recommendation # 4

Information Competency

To meet the standards the team recommends that the college use campus-wide dialog to develop ongoing instruction for users of library and learning support services to ensure students develop skills in Information Competency. (II.C.1.b)

Progress Made – Recommendation 4

Ensuring Students Develop Skills in Information Competency

In our Accreditation Follow Up Report the college outlined the dialogue and planning that took place to embed Information Competency curriculum into required or highly enrolled Freshmen courses. Two pilot programs – in Health 1 and English 1A were completed in Fall 2010. Faculty members from both courses continue to use multiple library orientations as tested in the Pilot. Both courses assess Information Competency in their Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)s. Library Faculty members meet frequently with Health and English faculty to review outcomes and make adjustments as necessary.

In addition, Library Faculty members meet regularly with Counseling Faculty to outline new coursework, workshops, and resources to recommend to their students. Currently the college offers two Library classes. One is structured as a 10-week, 2 credit class (LBR 8), and the other involves an intense workshop – four courses at .5 credits each (LBR 4-7). These courses are offered in 3 week sessions. The SLOs in all Library classes are continually assessed.

Finally, our Librarians have offered to incorporate information competency curriculum in any discipline that requests such assistance. This is accomplished by the Librarian meeting with the faculty member to analyze assignments and offer the curricular and orientation support to promote student success. To date, courses in Business, Chemistry, College Foundation Semester, Health, Microbiology, Political Science, Sociology and Zoology have “embedded” librarians.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 4

Ensuring Students Develop Skills in Information Competency

Our librarians engage in continuous dialogue with Instructional Faculty and Counselors in order to best support students in their studies, the college has met the requirements in the Accreditation standard for dialogue to create Information Competency learning support

services. The program is no longer in its developmental stage and now functions in a continuous cycle of assessment and improvement.

Evidence:

- 1) Accreditation Follow Up Report of October 15 2010
- 2) Course Outlines, SLOS for English 1A and Health 1
- 3) Library Guides for Information Competency (located on library homepage)

DRAFT

Recommendation #5 Ethics Code

To meet the standards the team recommends that the college develop a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel. (III.A.1.d)

Progress Made – Recommendation 5:

The College Develops a Written Code of Professional Ethics

As two constituency groups, Faculty and Classified, are represented by collective bargaining units, the college approached this recommendation using the current collective bargaining structure. Each professional category (Administrators, Faculty, and Classified) met to discuss and develop a code of ethics that met their constituency group's specific needs.

Administrators discussed and developed an ethics code over the course of several Administrative Staff Meetings. As we had administrative turnover over the past few years, the document was prepared in 2010 – 11 and was reviewed and updated in 2011 – 12. In each case, all administrators signed the document as an indicator of support and compliance with its content and meaning.

In the 2008-2009 academic year the Faculty Association (the Faculty collective bargaining unit) drafted language for an ethics code using contract language. The Academic Senate approved the document. In Spring 2012 the Faculty Association revised the document to reflect changes in the current contract language. Again, the Academic Senate approved this document.

The Classified Senate took the lead on the development of the Classified Ethics Code. The process was inclusive, and changes were adapted to meet the concerns/corrections given to the Senate by the LPC Classified Staff.

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 5:

The College Develops a Written Code of Professional Ethics

The college has met the requirements of this Accreditation standard for this recommendation. Each has numerous areas of overlap and all insist on mutual respect for colleagues and students. The themes of honesty and integrity are included in all three Code of Ethics documents.

Evidence:

- 1) Administrators Code of Ethics
- 2) Faculty Code of Ethics
- 3) Classified Code of Ethics

District and College Recommendation I

To meet the standards the team recommends that the district and the college maintain an updated functional map and that the district and the college engage in a program of systematic evaluation to assess both the effectiveness of district and college functional relationships and the effectiveness of services that support the institution. (Standard IIIA.6, IVB.3)

I. Progress Made:

A meeting was held with the Interim Chancellor and college staff to determine how best to proceed with the mapping process. It was decided that this document should be a fluid, usable document that will delineate the relationship of the colleges with the District.

The Interim Chancellor will, after discussion with the Chancellor's Cabinet, provide a draft to be distributed to the Chancellor's Council (composed of representatives of all major constituent groups for additional discussion and input. Once all input has been received from the colleges, a final document will be created.

This document will be presented to the Board of Trustees for information only by December, 2012.

II. Analysis of Results Achieved:

This document will be reviewed each year by the Chancellor's Council to ensure its accuracy and usefulness.

III. Evidence:

Minutes from Board of Trustees meetings and Chancellor's Council.

District and College Recommendation 2

To meet the standards, the team recommends that the district and the college complete the evaluation of the resource allocation process in time for budget development for the 2010-2011 academic year, ensuring transparency and assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations in supporting operations. (Standard IIID.L IIID.3, IVB.3)

I. Progress Made:

District Budget Study Group (DBSG) was formed in 2009 designed to evaluate the effectiveness and operations of the District Allocation Model. Led by a faculty member, the subgroup, known as “Nuts and Bolts” was composed of all constituent groups including faculty, classified staff, and administrators from both colleges and the District Office. The sub group was charged with the responsibility to study the structure and function of the Model and make recommendations to DBSG.

The Allocation Model was developed in the early 1990’s, and is based on the 1988 California law Assembly Bill 1725. The Program-Based Funding system established within the law directed funding from the State of California to each Community College district and then to the colleges and district operations based on researched best practices percentage formulas and state wide goals. While the AB 1725 formulas were not proscriptive to the districts, (the districts were not required to use the formulas), the DBSG recommended adoption of the formulas and Model and the Board of Trustees adopted the Allocation Model in 1994. The Model was modified in 2000 to include a Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) Allocation category which takes full-time faculty salaries “off the top” before the balance is allocated to each college for supplies, equipment, capital expenses, etc. In this manner, one college does not enjoy an advantage over the other if it has a younger faculty. The FTEF Allocation category was expanded after the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) was formed. This Committee was formed as a result of the 2002 through 2005 Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Faculty Association. The FTEF Allocation change was made to include adjunct faculty costs consistent with the FTEF allocation from DEMC. In addition, the Model has several other categories, including Special Allocations, which covers retiree benefits, Allocation to Specific Sites, including grants and other local revenue, and Discretionary Allocations, which functionally balances revenue to the District Office and Maintenance and Operations sectors after the allocations are made to each college.

The Nuts and Bolts subgroup reported to DBSG during the Spring semester of 2010 that the Allocation Model was flawed and outdated. It is important to note that in the wake of the allocation categories noted above, only a small percentage of revenue remains to be Split by Model, *e.g.*, in 2009-10, just 11 percent of the District’s \$112.0M unrestricted revenue was

indicated as Split by Model. In addition, there existed a strong perception among faculty and staff at the two colleges that the Model short-changed the colleges. In the current era of diminishing revenues from the state, funding reductions to non-instructional budgets appear to be deeper and more painful at the colleges. There may be a mathematical basis for such a phenomenon, because the allocation to the District Office is based on a flat 14.2 percent as suggested by AB 1725. This allocation includes certain administrative costs, such as funds for the Offices of the College Presidents and Administrative Vice Presidents that are in the present Model, but formally expensed within the college budgets. As part of its report to DGSG, the Nuts and Bolts subgroup recommended that DBSG critically review what constitutes District Services, to better understand what funding truly needs to be allocated for District Services and provide an appropriate level of support to the colleges. Further, it was noted that the District has a strong and functional mechanism which is found in the DEMC which is designed to allocate instructional costs. Developing a similar mechanism for other budget areas would be one possible approach to updating the current Allocation Model. Regardless, an updated Model would need to incorporate the DEMC allocations.

In addition, DBSG expanded the charge of the Nuts and Bolts subgroup to investigate allocation models in other multi-college districts in California in Spring 2010. To this end, the Vice Chancellor of Business Services provided a survey of allocation models from other districts in California [Exhibit (2) below]. The Nuts and Bolts subgroup reviewed the survey on the basis of a list of criteria-based questions provided by various committee members and other budget-oriented personnel in the District. The result of this work, as provided to DBSG, is given as Exhibit (3) below. It is interesting to note that allocation models in other Districts seem to work in two basic formats. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) Allocation Model provides revenue from the state allocation dollars to the colleges and district sites directly according to calculated percentages— while in contrast, in a number of districts' apportionment dollars go directly to the campuses, upon which a calculated amount is reallocated back to district operations for services rendered to the campus. This latter approach was intriguing to some members of the subgroup, based how it stresses District operations as a service-providing entity. However, it may be difficult to implement such an approach within the framework of our contractual DEMC process. The DEMC allocations account for variances at one campus which has a markedly larger framework of low-productivity programs such as Nursing and Dental Hygiene. Thus, by design, the instructional dollars allocated to the campuses are not proportional to their FTES targets.

During fiscal Year 2011-12, the apportionment revenue declined by approximately 7 percent, and was further impacted by a state-wide deficit of about 2.7 percent. Most of the spending reductions came from instructional accounts reductions. Through DEMC action, instructional programs were reduced by 10 percent, resulting in \$2.6M savings, with further concessions from the Faculty Association Agreement, saving an additional \$1.2M. Additional savings were needed from non-instructional expenses; however, the District elected to spend down revenue reserves in order to delay a reduction of classified staff. As such, the Board of Trustees approved budgets to the sites which allowed each college to spend in excess of their revenue allocations by the Model.

In Spring 2012, DBSG became aware that extraordinary and painful cuts to non-instructional expenses would be necessary. It was also clear that using the Allocation Model would create widely disparate impacts at each college site. After much dialogue, the DBSG membership recommended that Chabot College, Las Positas College, and the District Office would each reduce spending by \$1.5M, beyond the instructional savings previously identified. This recommendation was developed by discussing criteria outside of the Model and included the impact the reductions would have on each site's operations, given current expenditure patterns. Reductions, totaling \$4.5M, were presented to DBSG in May, 2012.

CLPCCD has engaged a consultant, Mr. Michael Hill, to work with DBSG to develop a new Allocation Model. The initial goal is to have this new Model in place for the development of a budget for Fiscal Year 2013-14. While some believe it is an ambitious stretch goal for the District, many believe it is essential to complete this goal quickly. The necessity of accomplishing this goal is compounded by the uncertainties surrounding the passage of Governor Brown's tax initiative on the November 2012 ballot. A District-wide dialogue has begun this Fall with the promise of progress in the air.

II. Analysis of Results

Establishing a new Allocation Model has been difficult during the current climate of budget reductions. Much effort and dialogue has been spent across the District seeking ways to support programs and services for students and this has hindered progress toward final solutions for a new model. During Summer 2012, emphasis has been placed on seeking solutions through Mr. Hall, the District Consultant for the District Budget Study Group. The basic analysis of the "Nuts and Bolts" subgroup results was summarized for DBSG in November 2010 [Exhibit (1) below]. Basic findings are:

The Model is based on program-based funding, which was replaced by California law SB 361

1. The Model has so many items taken "off the top" that it functions more like an expense model than an allocation model. This is evidenced by the fact that less than 12 percent of the District's total revenue is actually distributed by the model
2. As revenue is reduced from the state, non-instructional expenditure reductions appear to affect the colleges disproportionately
3. The basic allocation for District Services needs to be studied and better understood.

While the State of California Budget continues to decline and the result is a dramatic reduction in education and services for students, this fact makes developing a new allocation tool especially difficult. However, the effort to develop a fair and functional allocation model would be beneficial for all District entities. Ensuring and supporting fiscal responsibility will enhance the district in serving its students with the best practices available to our communities. In the development of the current budget, it is noted that the Tentative Budget approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2012, retains the practice from the prior year, of incorporating expenditure levels at each site that are inconsistent with revenue allocations. It is clear the Board of Trustees wishes to support student learning, success, and a well-qualified faculty and

support staff. The practice of allocating beyond revenues makes it essential that movement with our fiscal consultant is critical in order to sustain a balanced and fair budget into the next fiscal year.

The District acknowledges the need to develop an effective Model that determines equitable funding levels for each site. Initial discussions with the consultant, Michael Hill, have been positive. In the coming months, DBSG will need to perform closer analysis in several categories, including but not limited to spending at each site, where funding disparities persist, and how dollars can best be allocated to minimize the negative impact to college programs, and services provided to the surrounding communities. CLPCCD has met the intent and spirit of the District and College Recommendation 2 that directs the District and colleges to evaluate the resource allocation process, ensure transparency, and effectiveness of resource allocation in support of district-wide operations.

III. Evidence:

Allocation Model Issues and Recommendations Nov, 2010

(Specific to nuts and bolts of the current model)

Allocation Model Survey, March, 2010

(Survey of allocation mechanisms in other districts in California)

Allocation Model Questions Addressed May, 2010

(Includes the California survey and some initial recommendations)