

---

# Responses to Recommendations from the Previous Self-Study

---



*Las Positas College has developed into a fully accredited comprehensive institution. In 1988, the College was designated by the Board of Governors to be an independent college.*

*Las Positas College received full accreditation on January 7, 1991 from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.*

## 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)

### Response to Recommendation # 1A:

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (ORIP) plays a key role in the research activities of the college. Las Positas College continues to make excellent use of the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, whose skillset is exceptionally suited to the day-to-day needs of the college. In addition, the college has hired a full-time Research Analyst to assist in addressing the various research needs of the campus. The Research Analyst helps with gathering, processing, and analyzing customized data requests from the college community as well as the external community, and data for state, federal, and accreditation mandates. In addition, the Research Analyst helps prepare reports that are shared with the campus community.

ORIP produces a number of reports each year. An example of reports that the office produces is the comprehensive program review data packets for instructional and student services programs.<sup>1101</sup> Each year, a total of 150 program-level data packets are created that help faculty, staff, and administrators assess the types of students that are served as well as the productivity of their programs. The comprehensive program review data packets, which were initially produced in 2013 and only offered program information for the fall semesters, now provide information for both fall and spring semesters.

ORIP also plays a key role in survey research at the college. ORIP regularly conducts college-wide surveys, including student satisfaction surveys, student accreditation surveys, faculty/staff accreditation surveys, and graduation surveys.<sup>1102</sup> In addition, ORIP works with programs to conduct program-specific surveys.

The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) helps with the capacity of research at the college. In order to help fulfill its mission, the TLC staff continues to be actively involved in gathering and sharing data. In particular, the TLC helps in collection and reporting of Student Learning Outcome data, success and retention rates in distance education, distance education satisfaction surveys, success and retention rates of online tutoring, and satisfaction surveys of the services provided by TLC to the faculty and staff of the college. In addition, the TLC staff members have continued to assist faculty by supporting those who wish to develop and administer online surveys.

---

<sup>1101</sup> [Program review data packets](#)

<sup>1102</sup> [Survey conducted at LPC](#)

## Responses to Recommendations from the Previous Self-Study

In 2010, based on a highly participatory process, a strategic plan was created by the college that had ten goals, 59 strategies, and 116 key performance indicators (KPIs).<sup>1103</sup> The KPIs were created to determine to what extent the college met the strategies that were outlined. However, in 2012-2013, after the arrival of the new Director of Institutional Research and Planning, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee thoroughly reviewed the 116 KPIs and determined that only 22 KPIs were valid, useful, and could be assessed. As a result, 94 KPIs were eliminated by the College Council at the request of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Moreover, it was determined that clearer goals were needed for the college. In spring 2014, with direction from the executive team and support from the College Council, the College decided to concentrate on the following three focus goals: equity, completion, and excellence; these goals were placeholders until a revised educational master plan could be adopted; the college's educational master plan is currently being written and will be finished in fall 2015.

In spring 2014, the Integrated Planning Committee used the three focus goals, along with program review dean summaries and other planning documents to create the following 2014-2015 planning priorities:

- Accreditation
- Support for the curriculum process
- Technology utilization with emphasis on staff development
- Success and persistence through the basic skills sequence.

The aforementioned planning priorities were used in various areas of the college to drive planning and prioritize resources.

In spring 2015, the focus goals were used once again, along with results of SLOs, dean program review summaries and other planning documents to create the following 2015-2016 planning priorities:

- Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards
- Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance
- Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes
- Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE, and Transfer courses

Since the site visit in 2009, Las Positas College has implemented a clear, transparent, and accountable planning and budget cycle. The planning and budget cycle is comprised of four processes: program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and budget development. Each process has a specific goal. The goal of the program review process is the creation of dean program review summaries. The goal of the institutional planning process is to create planning priorities. The goal of the resource allocation process is to align prioritized resources to planning priorities. The goal of the budget development process is to align budget development with planning priorities. In addition, assessment of planning and budget occurs throughout the cycle to ensure the effectiveness of the activities and processes.

---

[1103 2010 to 2015 Strategic Plan](#)

In 2012-2013, the college went through a highly participatory process of reviewing and approving revised Mission, Vision, and Values Statements.

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 among other sets of data, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and completion data to initiate curricular and departmental changes. As an example, the success the English Department's analysis of learning/completion outcomes of accelerated versus non-accelerated courses is notable. A pilot project is underway that supports students to succeed in English that is one level greater than assessment scores indicate. Early results of the pilot indicate positive outcomes for students. Evaluation of these and similar data allowed the English Department to increase the number of accelerated course offerings with additional lab time as a means to support student completion.

### **Response to Recommendation # 1B:**

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 continue about the best process to expand the official role of the Program Review Committee to provide guidance to all areas that conduct program reviews.

Our last Program Review Full Report Cycle began in 2013—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. Deans also provided feedback to authors and develop a division summary that is vetted with the Division members at their monthly meeting. The summary is forwarded to the Vice Presidents and President to be used along with the actual Program Reviews when the annual budget is completed. Portions of the Program Reviews are expected to be included in requests for faculty, instructional equipment, and non-instructional staff and administrators.

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?" During 2012-2013 Academic Year, the effectiveness of the Common Tool was evaluated. The data demonstrated that the Common Tool did not serve the institution well and was removed as part of the Program Review Process.

In spring 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

## Responses to Recommendations from the Previous Self-Study

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 2012, 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.

Since 2012, feedback has been regularly solicited and the Program Review Committee has evaluated the effectiveness of the document used for Program Review. After each use, the committee solicits feedback from the users and updates the document to incorporate recommendations.

Each spring, the various allocation committees on campus (Faculty Hiring Prioritization, Planning and Budget, Staff Development, etc.) evaluate their application documents/forms and amend them to consistently reinforce that Program Review data is the central source for 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. As the process of Program Review and the integrated nature of funding based on program reviews has become more of a presence, many more Program Review documents have included concrete data in support of departmental requests. Allocation committees have established a goal of having the process more streamlined.

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. With the advent of the new Integrated Planning Committee, the decision/recommendation was to place the responsibility for the review and assimilation of the information from Program Reviews on the Integrated Planning Committee. This process began in earnest in spring 2014 when the IPC reviewed Program Review documents to make recommendations about college priorities for 2014-2015 academic year.

In spring 2010, our Director of Research and Planning 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.<sup>1104</sup>

In fall 2014, another college-wide survey was conducted that included items related to the effectiveness of planning. Nearly two-thirds of employees that were surveyed agreed that the College uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes.<sup>1105</sup>

Las Positas College regularly surveys faculty, staff, and administrators to assess our governance systems. The fall 2014 employee survey indicates that nearly two-thirds of the respondents believed that governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness.<sup>1106</sup>

---

<sup>1104</sup> [Spring 2010 Strategic Planning Survey](#)

<sup>1105</sup> [Fall 2014 employee accreditation survey](#)

<sup>1106</sup> [Fall 2014 employee accreditation survey](#)

## 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.

### Response to Recommendation #2:

The college continues to meet this recommendation in that, since 2012, both full-time and part-time faculty have been actively engaged in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes. In January 2012, 74% of courses had SLOs; as of June 1, 2015, that number had risen to 99%. Similarly, in January 2012, 49% of course-level SLOs had been assessed. As of June 1, 2015, 93% of course-level SLOs had been assessed.

The College has worked diligently to engage full time and part time faculty in identifying and assessing SLOs. One step taken to encourage part-time faculty participation was a contractual agreement to compensate part-time faculty for "developing and/or assessing SLOs, CLOs, and/or PLOs."<sup>1107</sup>

Also, the administration made SLO development and assessment a priority, stressing the importance of this work in meetings, through e-mail, and in the dedication of significant reassignment time. Monthly reports have been generated from the eLumen database and provided to faculty at each division meeting. Periodic updates have been given to faculty at Town Meetings with the status of completion emphasized. Deans in the Academic divisions have regularly sent e-mails to specific faculty and/or met with specific faculty regarding completion of SLOs for their courses and assessments of courses to be entered into the database for tracking.

Most recently, in spring 2015, the college offered 70% reassignment time for a faculty member who would work with other faculty, one-on-one, supporting those who need help assessing their SLOs. The work of this faculty member had a significant impact as seen in the rise in assessment numbers since January 2015. Among his many efforts, the faculty member helped develop a Google survey, which simplified the process of entering SLO data into eLumen. He also contacted and worked with specific faculty members, supporting SLO development and assessment.

In addition, March 27, 2015, motivated by the work on the self-study report, faculty leadership from key campus committees engaged in a "Common Ground" meeting with the intention of formulating a plan focused on the College's SLO process to present to the broader campus community. Recommendations

---

<sup>1107</sup> [Faculty Association MOU](#)

## Responses to Recommendations from the Previous Self-Study

from this meeting resulted in a plan for more flex days in 2015-2016 focused on SLO assessment; more staff development to help all faculty, but part-time faculty in particular, engage in SLO assessment; clearer communication with students about SLOs; and more research in best practices regarding SLOs.

The College has also made progress in its effort to encourage dialog about SLO results rather than the SLO process through program review. SLO data and assessment is the centerpiece of the Program Review template, requiring the program faculty to assess SLO results and use these results in planning. Programs are asked how they use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning, whether their assessment results show a need for new SLOs, and what percentage of their courses their programs will assess in the next academic year. As the 2014 Program Planning Updates reveal, programs have been engaging in rich and authentic assessment that results in actions taken to improve student learning.

The program review process has also been a vehicle for using SLO assessment results to inform planning and resource allocation decisions. SLO assessment results, as captured in program review, are read by division deans and summarized, along with other vital information, with input from the Program Review Committee and members of the division. The finalized summary is sent to the Integrated Planning Committee for use in creating planning priorities, which help guide the budget and allocations for the following year.

### **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)

#### **Response Recommendation 3A:**

The college has addressed the recommendation to fully integrate its process for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its process for program review and planning. The 2011-2012 program review template asked writers to include an analysis of SLO data, and more recent program review update templates have focused on SLO data as a central component of their review.<sup>1108, 1109</sup> The college's program review process, which has as its centerpiece the assessment of SLO data, feeds the College Planning Process, the Resource Allocation Process and the Budget Development Process, as described in LPC Integrated Planning and Budget Cycle (Evidence: LPC Integrated Planning and Budget Cycle). Program review data, including SLO data, is captured for the use of planning committees in the form of deans' summaries, which have been designed to be more useful than the former mechanism for capturing this information, which was called The Common

---

<sup>1108</sup> [2011-2012 Program Review Template](#)

<sup>1109</sup> [Program Review](#)

Tool.<sup>110</sup> The SLO data, as described and assessed in program review, is analyzed and reported in concert with student achievement data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and, in some cases, other types of data collected by the program faculty, providing a broad data “picture” essential to the planning process. This broad data picture is also a valuable means by which different types of data may be evaluated and more deeply assessed.<sup>111</sup> The college continues to refine its processes in an effort to make them more meaningful and transparent. The Program Review Committee has conducted surveys to gather feedback from programs across the campus.<sup>112, 113</sup> Working with survey data, the SLO Committee and the Integrated Planning Committee, the Program Review Committee continues to revise the Program Review Template to reflect the needs of the SLO and planning processes. As evident in the meeting minutes, committee chairs have worked closely together to integrate these processes, and continue to do so.<sup>114, 115, 116</sup> Due to the vast workload that each committee engages in, the Program Review Committee and the SLO Committee chose not to merge, but, instead, to closely collaborate. Evidence of this close collaboration can be seen on the Program Review webpage, which has a link to the SLO chair to support writers on program review in their effort to complete the SLO portion of the template.<sup>117</sup>

### Response to Recommendation 3B:

The college has fully implemented a program review process for all administrative programs and services as is evident from the program review updates in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. Since 2012, the formerly “Instructional Program Review Committee” has become the “Program Review Committee” in that it oversees the program review process for both Student Services and Academic Services.<sup>118, 119</sup>

---

[1110 PRC minutes, 09-24-14](#)

[1111 Program Review data packets](#)

[1112 Evaluation of IPR survey results, 03-21-11](#)

[1113 PPU survey results, 02-11-15](#)

[1114 Program Review Committee minutes, 01-28-15](#)

[1115 SLO Committee minutes, 09-12-11](#)

[1116 SLO Committee minutes, 03-03-14](#)

[1117 Instructional Program Review](#)

[1118 Program Review](#)

[1119 Program Review Committee Charge](#)



## **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)

### **Response to Recommendation #4:**

The college continues to meet this standard as evidenced by the many means by which it provides on-going instruction in Information Competency for users of the library and learning support services. The college provides instruction on research and information competency skills taught in the four Library Skills courses, library orientations tailored to support specific courses, learning communities in which librarians are embedded, instructional content and tutorials posted on the library website, and reference service provided in person, over the phone, and via email. [1120](#), [1121](#), [1122](#)

## **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)

### **Response to Recommendation #5:**

The college continues to meet this standard as evidenced by the code of ethics written for all of its personnel using the collectively bargained standards for conduct.

---

[1120 ACRL Information Competency Standards](#)

[1121 Library Statistics: Orientations](#)

[1122 Library Student Survey, Spring 2014](#)

## **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)

### **Response to Recommendation #6:**

Our IV: The District / College meets this standard as evidenced by the Board of Trustees' and the Chancellor's commitment to Board development and training. BP 2740 specifies Board Education, and the extensive list of Board policies 2010 through 2750 outline matters regarding Board elections, terms of office, and self-evaluation.<sup>1123, 1124</sup>

### **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)

### **Response to District / College Recommendation 1:**

Since the Midterm Report, the District and the Colleges, with the guidance of the District Senior Leadership team, reviewed and revised the District Function Map in fall 2014. At that time, a separate "Task Map" was also created to better illustrate the department functions that were assigned to the District and the Colleges.

### **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 III.D.I, III.D.3, IV.B.3)

### **Response to District and College Recommendation #2: (Chabot)**

The District now operates under a new Budget Allocation Model (BAM) that was approved by District Budget Study Group in March 2013, and implemented with the Adoption Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014. The BAM is clearer than the previous model. It can be summarized as follows: From the aggregated revenue (which includes general apportionment, mandated costs, and other faculty reimbursements), set districtwide expenses (known as "Step 3A" costs, which includes retiree benefits, gas and electric costs, property and liability insurance, etc.) are taken off the top. Allocations are made to the District Office and Maintenance and Operations (M&O) according to set percentages. The remaining revenue is split between the colleges according to Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) targets.

---

<sup>1123</sup> [Board Policy 2740](#)

<sup>1124</sup> [Index of Revised Board Policies](#)