LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACCREDITATION MIDTERM REPORT

Submitted to the

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2012

LAS POSITAS
C O L L E G E

3000 Campus Hill Drive
Livermore, CA 94551

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 Chabot-Las Positas
Community College District and the college campus community and that the Midterm Report
accurately responds to the Accrediting Commission's recommendations.

Signed,

_____

Dr. Judy E. Walters, Interim Chancellor, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

_____

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

_____

Dr. Kevin G. Walthers, President, Las Positas College

_____

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

_____

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

_____

Ms. Cherry-Ronaule Bogue, 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 five Recommendations cited by the Commission during the October 19 – 22, 2009 Comprehensive visit. The following narrative describes the process used to prepare this report and identifies those who were involved in its preparation.

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. (Team Template; Team Reports)

During summer 2012, 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 on September 18, 2012 and subsequent acceptance. The following list identifies the members of the Recommendation teams ([Minutes from Academic Senate, August 22, 2012](#); [Minutes from College Council, September 20, 2012](#)):

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 1 B. 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 Steffan – 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
Laura Weaver - District 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

Evidence:

[Team Template](#)

[Team Reports](#)

[Minutes from Academic Senate, August 22, 2012](#)

[Minutes from September 20, 2012 College Council Meeting](#)

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 for planning purposes. The primary reasons for our dramatic improvement in increasing our capacity are: (January 2012 Administrator Retreat)

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. Research generated was provided to committees and campus community for planning and resource allocation purposes. (Researcher Project List from 2010 – 11 and 2011 - 12, Completed Research Requests, Fall 2011 Research and Planning Status of Projects, Spring 2012 Research and Planning Status of Projects, Summer 2012 Research and Planning Status of Projects)

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 mission of the Teaching and Learning Center is to inspire

and enable faculty to enhance teaching and learning through the effective use of instructional technologies. Providing quality resources and focused training and support, the TLC is the hub of the college's professional development activities that contribute to the pedagogical and technical knowledge of LPC faculty, staff and administrators. The TLC also provides leadership, coordination and planning of the college's Distance Education efforts. Those efforts are manifested in exceptional, learner-centered courses that make use of innovative technologies and are accessible to a diverse group of students, including those with disabilities. 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. (TLC Project List, TLC website)

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 and use it for planning and resource allocation purposes. (List of training held in 2011 – 12 and Fall 2012, Flex Day Agendas)

Planning Agenda for Institutional Effectiveness

 In 2009 – 2010 academic year, LPC created an overarching strategic planning/institutional effectiveness program review model was implemented in the 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. As a living document, the following are areas of ongoing campus-wide discussion. (LPC Strategic Plan Document)

1. 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. There first goal for the college that emphasizes teaching and learning. Remaining goals are qualitative in nature and measurement on each area has met with varying levels of success. (Strategic Plan) (2011 – 12 Minutes from Institutional Effectiveness Committee and College Council)

2. A strategic planning process. 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. ([Strategic Plan](#))

3. Key Performance Indicators (KPI). The newly formed Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) was charged with tracking and monitoring the progress of college-wide indicators identified in the Strategic Plan. The task was daunting with a substantial amount of data to track, making it difficult for the committee to be fully effective in its work. In addition, subsequent accreditation standards and state compliance issues that have come after publication were integrated into the KPIs as well. (Minutes from [Institutional Effectiveness](#) and [College Council](#) Committees)

4. Committee processes and expectations. 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).   ([Shared Governance Handbook](#))

   When the new set of expectations for the committees was developed and moved to implementation, College Council served 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. In the spring of 2012 the College Council accepted the role of leading a systematic review of the college's mission statement, values statement and strategic plan. ([Governance Handbook](#), [Committee Interaction Chart](#), [Review Process Documents](#))

   The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) has as its primary function allocation for Instructional Equipment and prioritization of the institution's needs for non-instructional personnel based on needs identified in program review documents. 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 but equitable process. ([PBC Minutes](), [Governance Handbook](), [Committee Interaction Chart]())

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 college-wide goals needed to achieve success; assessment of steps taken to ensure broad input from constituency groups during planning processes; and incorporation of student success measures into evaluation processes. ([May 2012 Minutes from IEC](), [Committee Interaction Chart]())

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. As an example, the success the Writing Program's analysis of learning/completion outcomes of accelerated versus non-accelerated courses is notable. Findings reveal that students choosing accelerated programs had success rates equal to those in traditional time frame courses. Evaluation of these data allowed the Writing Program to increase the number of accelerated course offerings as a means to support student completion. ([English department agenda, English department Course list changes, English department's Program Review Document]())

As the Institutional Effectiveness Committee continues to mature in its ability to integrate research findings into planning, LPC will continue to increase the use of data for decision-making to improve institutional planning, program planning, and to foster student success and completion.

In September 2012, the College Council approved the implementation of a new shared governance Planning Task Force. The charge of this group is to:

1. Present recommendations to College Council with regard to closing the gap in the planning and allocation process; (relates to Accreditation)

2. Recommend prioritization of the College's educational outcomes;

3. Serve as a liaison between the Las Positas College Council and the District Budget Study Group (DBSG) with regard to aligning college goals as outlined in the College's Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Values Statement, and Strategic Plan with the Mission of Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD). (LPC Planning Task Force Charge)

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. This team is now fostering the training of "champions" to support others as they begin the journey of research-based assessment or evaluation of program planning.

Planning Agenda for Institutional Effectiveness

As described above, the institutional model initiated in 2009 was implemented with modest success in spite of multiple changes in campus leadership that required time to understand and support the manner in which the college functioned. ([Committee Interaction Chart](#))

As a result of the analysis of Recommendation 1A., LPC has identified the following as next steps:

1. Review, and revise if needed, the college mission and vision statements and streamline and reformulate college goals. A formal request by Academic Senate initiated this process and the administrative team, through the College Council, has moved forward in fulfilling this commitment.

2. Revisit the college's strategic goals to ensure they are aligned with student learning outcomes and completion expectations.

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. LPC has taken the essential step of forming a Planning Task Force Committee designed to accomplish our institutional goals, improvement plans, and Key Performance Indicators.

4. Key Performance Indicators will be reviewed by designated committees for relevance to current organizational relevance and translated into specific, measureable, achievable, realistic, and trackable (SMART) goals. All goals have been placed in a similar format used for the College's Improvement Plans with key point person or committee, status, and time frame identified. ([Key Performance Indicator Chart](#))

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

Capacity for Research
Researcher project list
Completed Research Requests
Fall 2011 Research and Planning Status of Projects
Spring 2012 Research and Planning Status of Projects
Summer 2012 Research and Planning Status of Projects
Flex day
Agenda for January 2012 Retreat for Administrators
TLC Research Project
TLC workshops
Flex Day Agenda 2012
Fulfill its planning agenda with respect to institutional research
Goals, Vision and Mission statements
Models from the Common Ground Committee
Strategic Plan
IEC minutes with discussions of challenges with KPIs highlighted
Minutes from PBC with discussion re: IE role highlighted
Shared Governance Committee Charges and membership
Committee Interaction Chart
Integrate Institutional Effectiveness Research into Planning
English department's meeting minutes – the schedule of course offerings before and after accelerated course research
English department's program review
Key Performance Indicator Chart

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. Discussions have begun this year to expand the official role of the Program Review Committee to provide guidance to all areas that conduct program reviews. (Program Review Charge, Instructional, Student Services, and Non-Instructional Program Review Templates)

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. Program Review mentors read each document and provided feedback and recommended additions and changes to the authors. (Program Review Samples: Anthropology, ECD, English, Library Skills, Sociology, Instructional Program Review Summaries, Process of Review/Validation for Program Review)

Each entity that submitted a Program Review document was asked to complete a summary document cataloging 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?" (Maintenance Form, Development Form)

In the Spring of 2011 the Program Review Committee sent out a survey to faculty soliciting feedback on the new Program Review process. In general, those faculty members who responded, 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. The goal was to capture changes in data and

guide faculty further in assessment of their Student Learning Outcomes. (Flex Day Agenda Spring 2011, Faculty Survey and Results)

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; however, none was received. Allocation committees have established a goal of having the process more streamlined. (Application forms from Faculty Hiring Prioritization, Staff Development, Planning and Budget, Basic Skills Committees, Rubrics/Review Sheets for Planning and Budget, Basic Skills, Program Review Minutes and agendas)

At the beginning of 2012, the Program Review Committee addressed the issue of validation of Program Review results, culminating in a proposal submitted to the Academic Senate and College Council. This proposal identified the College Council as the validation committee. The proposal defines the connection of the results of Program Reviews to other committees which perform planning for the institution and resource allocation processes. (Process Model Proposal from Program Review)

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 more work was required to ensure full understanding of our college goals and strategic plan. The survey revealed that a large percentage of the college community understood that our strategic plan was linked to our program planning. (College-wide Survey on Strategic Planning and Results)

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

Las Positas College regularly surveys faculty, staff, and administrators to assess our governance systems, with the next survey scheduled in 2013. The Director of Research is working with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to ensure that future surveys reflect the college's emphasis on meaningful research. (Survey results)

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 1B

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

Overall, Las Positas College has had success with our assessment of Program Review. The LPC community is proud of, and grateful for, the dedication of the Program Review Committee and its leadership. Over the past several years, the committee membership has solicited and received feedback, responding with diligence to its constituents. Las Positas College has successfully met the requirements of this recommendation.

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

The economic downturn and administrative turnover have led to reprioritization of some goals and related tasks. The current campus leadership took intentional and deliberate steps to establish a systematic, sustainable process. This has resulted in developing a robust program led by a Director of Research who has been able to complete projects quickly and disseminate relevant and meaningful data and information to the college community.

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.

As a result of the analysis of Recommendation 1 B., LPC has identified the following as next steps:

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. 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 into planning processes.

Evidence

Program Review Charge
Instructional, Student Services, and Non-Instructional Program Review Templates
Program Review Samples: Anthropology, ECD, English, Library Skills, Sociology
Instructional Program Review Summaries
Process of Review/Validation for Program Review

Common Tool Maintenance Form
Common Tool Development Form
Sample common tool forms – maintenance and development
Flex Day Agenda Spring 2011
Faculty Survey and Results
Application forms from Faculty Hiring Prioritization, Staff Development, Planning and Budget, Basic Skills Committees
Rubrics/Review Sheets for Planning and Budget, Basic Skills
Program Review Minutes and agendas
Process Model Proposal from Program Review
College-wide Survey on Strategic Planning and Results
Survey results

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 two actins: the contractual agreement to compensate adjuncts to participate in the SLO process, and a commitment from the new college President and Vice President for Academic Services team to make this a priority. 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%. ([Faculty Association Tentative Agreement Article 18T. and 21G.2.b](), [eLumen Reports](), [Town Meeting Agendas]() and [SLO/Assessment Reports](), "[Accreditation This Week" documents February through May]())

The increase in recording and assessment of SLOs also reflected improvements made to our software system by our Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff. Anecdotally faculty have registered concerns over the years that our SLO management system, eLumen, was limited in its ability to analyze data and was not user-friendly. The eLumen vendor made the software easier for faculty to use. The TLC staff also create web forms which would allow instructors to avoid the software interaction altogether. ([TLC Web Forms for documentation](), [outcomes](), [student services]())

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

19

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 (June 2012). 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, the college is in the development stage for the creation and assessment of Program Level SLOs. Currently, 53% of programs have defined SLOs, and annually 31% of programs are assessing their SLOs. (Town Meeting Agendas and SLO/Assessment Reports, "Accreditation This Week" documents February through May)

Encourage dialog about assessment results rather than process

In 2010, the college identified the Program Review document as the primary vehicle for reporting and analyzing the results of SLO assessments. SLO data and information are increasingly embedded into the Program Review process, with the Spring 2012 Program Review updates emphasizing SLO assessment and analysis. The March 29, 2012 Faculty Flex Day was used exclusively as an "Assessment Day," with poster workshops where participants created models of SLO measurement, assessment, implementation, and reassessment. (Assessment Day/Flex Day Agenda, Samples of Posters Minutes)

In 2010, the Program Review Committee and Student Learning Outcomes Committee meeting times were configured to coincide in order to facilitate more collaboration and address issues that overlap the two committees. (Assessment Day/Flex Day Agenda, Samples of Posters Minutes)

Use assessment results to improve student learning

Disciplines have consistently been meeting to dialogue about student assessments. The Flex Days in March 2012 and Fall 2011 provided time for the disciplines to meet and discuss the assessment results. Department meetings have allowed time to focus on improving student results through those assessment/analysis dialogues. The English Department met over 2011 – 2012 academic year, and the Kinesiology Department has had several meetings during the current academic year to discuss SLOs and closing the loop on the process with final assessments being entered into the eLumen database. Dialogue continues across all disciplines to address student learning outcomes and related student needs. (English and Kinesiology Department Meeting minutes)

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 allocation 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. (Request forms from PBC (Classified, Admin, [Instructional Equipment](#), [Staff Development](#)), [Faculty Hiring Prioritization](#) Committees [Program Review Template](#) and [Updated forms](#))

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. The SLOs were embedded in the Program Review process and documents supplied to the consultants. ([CLPCCD 2012 DRAFT Educational Master Plan](#))

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 Committee has identified a future goal in 2012-2013 to improve mapping 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. We have discovered that our SLO management system, eLumen, has fed into this issue by being somewhat limiting in the type of data available for analysis. The SLO Committee has allowed faculty to create their own rubric for SLO assessments. The College should consider 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.

Student Services and Non-Instructional personnel have created student learning 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). ([Student Services minutes](#))

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 a rate of 92%, and demonstrated significant improvement during the academic year. Similar goals need to be set each year, and these goals need to be

incorporated and validated by allocation committees. 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 dialogue about assessment results rather than process

Dialogue has significantly increased across the college community during the past year as evidenced by the discussions in various committees and at division and department meetings. Education through the weekly newsletter *Accreditation This Week* provided information and up-to-date data regarding SLO completion and the importance of analyzing assessment results in the most recent Program Review Update. Faculty Flex Days offered time and demonstrated processes used in several pioneering departments as a model for encouraging dialogue in disciplines across the campus.

Use assessment results to improve student learning

Disciplines have been meeting to dialogue about student assessments. The Flex Days in Spring 2012 and Fall 2011 provided time for the disciplines to meet and discuss the assessment results. There have also been department meetings focused on improving student results through the assessments. The English department met over the 2011-2012 academic year and Math plans on meeting Fall 2012. Dialogue will continue across the disciplines to address the students' learning needs.

Use assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation decisions

The College continues to improve the use of SLO assessment results for planning and resource allocation decisions. Allocation committees require Program Review support prior to approving any request. Allocation committee members understand that SLOs are embedded in Program Review documents; therefore, they are included in requests for funds.

Based on the analysis of Recommendation 2, LPC has identified the following as next steps:

1. Continue to 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 to actively pursue 100 % compliance for SLOs.

Evidence:

      Faculty Association Tentative Agreement Article 18T. and 21G.2.b
      eLumen Reports
      Town Meeting Agendas and SLO/Assessment Reports
      "Accreditation This Week" documents February through May

TLC Web Forms for documentation
Outcomes
Student Services
Assessment Day/Flex Day Agenda
Samples of Posters Minutes
 English and Kinesiology Department Meeting minutes
Request forms from PBC: Instructional Equipment, Staff Development
Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committees
Program Review Template and Updated forms
CLPCCD 2012 DRAFT Educational Master Plan
Student Services minutes

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 March 2011 to discuss programs' progress on SLOs to date and strategize ways to support further progress. (Accreditation Follow Up Report – 2010; Program Review Samples: Anthropology, ECD, English, Library Skills, Sociology; Instructional Program Review Validation Worksheet with examples; Minutes from Joint Program Review and SLO Committees Fall 2011 and Spring 2012; Program Review Update Form; Update Trends/Themes Form, Update summary themes.

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 a poster workshop, and examine the role of LPC's Core Competencies in relation to actual student transcripts. (Spring 2012 Flex Day Agenda, Sample Posters, Core Competencies document, Sample Student Transcripts)

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

As evidenced in the response to Recommendation 1A, Las Positas College has taken intentional and deliberate steps to integrate program review into planning. 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. Each committee receives development or maintenance information documented from the Program Review in the Common Tool to assess and analyze while making allocation decisions. (Common Tool [Maintenance](#) and [Development](#) Forms)

Las Positas College has demonstrated success in integrating Program Review into the various allocation processes at the college. Allocation 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. (Request Forms for [Faculty Hiring Prioritization](#) Committee and [Staff Development](#)).

The issue of validation of Program Review results 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. ([Program Review Round Table Minutes, January 2012](#); [Process Model Proposal from Program Review](#); [Minutes from IEC, May 2012](#))

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 IRPC'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 by June 30, 2014.

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. The college-wide process requires 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 the need for greater understanding of individual programs. As outlined in Recommendation 1A, College Council serves 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 shift of responsibilities for this committee.

Evidence:

> Accreditation Follow Up Report of 2010
> Program Review Samples: Anthropology, ECD, English, Library Skills, Sociology
> Minutes from Joint Program Review and SLO Committees Fall 2011 and Spring 2012
> Program Review Update Form
> Update Trends/Themes Form
> Update summary themes
> March 29, 2012 Flex Day Agenda
> Posters from Flex Day Workshop
> Core Competencies Document
> Sample Student Transcripts
> Common Tool Program Maintenance Form
> Common Tool Program Development Form
> Faculty Prioritization and Staff Development request forms
> Program Review Roundtable Agenda and Minutes
> Process Model Proposal from Program Review
> Minutes from IEC, May 2012

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 has been worked on through collaboration is connecting program requests from all sectors into the Common Tool for updates, planning models, mentoring, etc. (Accreditation Follow Up Report 2010; Non-Instructional Program Review Form, Samples (Technology and Teaching & Learning) of Non-Instructional Program Reviews)

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 was 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. (Common Tool including Non-Instructional Program Review; Sample Maintenance and Development Forms)

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 3B:

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 developing lines of communication/reporting structures in these instances (for example, our Staff Development Committee is not an Academic Senate Subcommittee as they serve the entire campus's staff development needs). (Agenda and Minutes from Program Review for September 12, 2012)

Evidence:

Accreditation Follow Up Report
Non-Instructional Program Review Form
Samples (Technology and Teaching & Learning) of Non-Instructional Program Reviews
Common Tool including Non-Instructional Program Review
Sample Maintenance and Development Forms
Agenda and Minutes from Program Review for September 12, 2012

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 – 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). Library Faculty members meet frequently with Health and English faculty to review outcomes and make adjustments as necessary. (Accreditation Follow Up Report 2010; Course Outlines and Student Learning Outcomes for Health 1 and English 1A)

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. (Course outlines and SLOs for LIB 8 and LIB 4-7)

LPC Librarians 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. (BUSN 30, BUSN 48, HLTH 1)

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 4

Ensuring Students Develop Skills in Information Competency

The college has met the requirements in the Accreditation Standard for dialogue to create Information Competency learning support services. College librarians engage in continuous dialogue with Instructional Faculty and Counselors in order to support students in their studies.

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

Evidence

Accreditation Follow Up Report 2010
Course Outlines, SLOs for English 1A and Health 1
Library 8 and Library 4-7 Course Outlines and SLOs
Embedded Librarian Support for other courses - BUSN 30, BUSN 48, HLTH 1

Recommendation #5

Code of Professional Ethics

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. The document was prepared in 2010 – 2011 and was reviewed and updated in 2011 – 2012. In each case, 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. The Classified Senate approved the Classified Ethics Code. Administrators Code of Ethics, Faculty Code of Ethics, Classified Code of Ethics, Classified Senate Approval of Code of Ethics

Analysis of Results Achieved – Recommendation 5:

The College Develops a Written Code of Professional Ethics

The college has met the requirements for this recommendation. Each Code of Ethics 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:

Administrators Code of Ethics
Faculty Code of Ethics
Classified Code of Ethics
Classified Senate Approval of Code of Ethics

Recommendation 6 (District / College Recommendation)

In order to improve, the team recommends that the Board establish and formally adopt a clearly delineated orientation program for new Board members. (Standard IV.B.I.d, IV.B.I.e, IV.B.i.f)

Progress Made:

A new board policy, BP7054 with procedures has been written which delineates the process for orientation of new board members as well as student trustees.

Analysis of Results Achieved:

The BP7054 policy was disseminated through the Chancellor's Council, September 11, 2012 which is made up representatives of all major constituent groups. Once it was disseminated and returned to the Council was moved to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The BP7054 policy and procedures was on the board agenda for first reading on September 18, 2012 and second reading approval October 16, 2012.

Evidence:

7054 Board Education: Board Policy and Administrative Rules & Procedures

Minutes from the September 11, 2012 Chancellor's Council Meeting

Agenda and Minutes from September 18, 2012 CLPCCD Board Meeting

Agenda from October 16, 2012 CLPCCD Board Meeting

District / College Recommendation 1

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 III.A.6, IV.B.3)

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 and Vice Chancellor of Education and Planning met and organized the current functional map for review by Chancellor's Cabinet. A schedule has been created to gather input from constituent groups through Chancellor's Council for a draft document to be presented to the Board of Trustees at their December 3, 2012 meeting.

Analysis of Results Achieved:

The current functional map document identifying the areas needed to be reviewed and validated was assigned to the responsible staff to conduct a detailed review and validation of their respective areas.

These assignments with deadlines was issued by memo on October 4, 2012 to the responsible individuals for each area. The results will be disseminated to the Chancellors Council for consultation on October 9, 2012 and on the Chancellor's Cabinet agenda for October 17, 2012.

Evidence:

Links available at http://www.clpccd.org/board/Chancellor.php

September 28, 2008 map document

Schedule and assignments

Meeting agenda from October 9, 2012 Chancellor's Council

Meeting agenda October 17, 2012 Chancellor's Cabinet

District / 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 III.D.I, III.D.3, IV.B.3)

Progress Made:

The District Budget Study Group (DBSG), made up of 30 members representing every constituency, was convened by the Vice Chancellor of Business Services in 2009 and designed to evaluate the effectiveness and transparency of the revenue allocation process. In November 2009, three subgroups were formed addressing the following topics: 1) Three Year Budget Data Analysis; 2) Board Policy 3) Allocation Model – Nuts and Bolts. In March 2010, a fourth subgroup was formed 4) Health Benefits Group. The sub-groups met periodically and for the next two years provided the DBSG with updates on their work and progress. Below is a summary of their work.

Three Year Budget Data Analysis

Led by a faculty member, the Budget Data Analysis group attempted to do the trend analysis using various accounts by department for Las Positas College. The group looked at historical data and how it compared to the current budget. They encountered a number of hurdles including extracting certain data and how data is treated from year to year.

The group discovered that the work was very complicated and time consuming so in May 2010, the lead faculty stated that the group was no longer viable because neither the resources nor the support was available at the time.

Board Policy

Led by a college President, the group discussed the following:

> a. charge of the committee
> b. District's current Mission Statement
> c. policy for the relationship to the colleges and the district
> d. collegial consultation with administrative rules and procedures
> e. the budget allocation model
> f. California education code that affects all the above
> g. SB361, which is the enactment of that code
> h. draft of the guiding principles that were developed by members of the academic senates
> i. draft changes to the board policy prepared by the Vice Chancellor

j. statement of the principles of sound fiscal management.

The group identified some guiding principles and the philosophical statement on how students are served. A draft of the policy was presented to the DBSG for consideration by the group and their feedback.

Health Benefits

Led by staff, the group reviewed benefits levels from other districts including their cap on benefits. The Faculty Association objected to the formation of the group and expressed that benefit discussions are the responsibility of the negotiations table. The Health Benefits group was discontinued.

Allocation Model – Nuts and Bolts

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 1994, and was 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. This 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.

The FTEF Allocation category was expanded after the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) was formed as a result of the 2002 - 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, this 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 this Model, *e.g.*, in 2009-10, just 11 percent of the District's $112.0M unrestricted revenue was indicated as Split by this 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 DBSG, 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. 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 was provided to DBSG. 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 because it was based upon the foundation that District operations are 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 began Fall 2012 with the promise of completion by Spring 2013.

Analysis of Results Achieved:

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 the work of Mr. Hill, the District Consultant for the DBSG.

The basic analysis of the "Nuts and Bolts" subgroup results was summarized for DBSG in November 2010. 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 the 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 do a 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 / College Recommendation 2 that directs the District and colleges to evaluate the resource allocation process, ensure transparency, and effectiveness of resource allocation supporting operations.

Evidence:

DBSG Membership

DBSG Membership by Position

DBSG Meeting Minutes-August 27, 2010

DBSG Meeting Minutes-October 8, 2010

DBSG Meeting Minutes-March 5, 2010

DBSG Meeting Minutes-March 30, 2012

Allocation Model Issues and Recommendations Nov, 2010

Allocation Model Survey, March, 2010

Allocation Model Questions Addressed May, 2010