Follow-Up Report

West Valley College

14000 Fruitvale Avenue

Saratoga, CA 95070

This Report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited

West Valley College on April 16, 2015

Submitted to:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Submitted by:

Dr. Rajen Vurdien, President, Fullerton College -- Team Chair

Dr. Melinda Womack, Professor, Santiago Canyon College -- Team member

Dr. James Temple, Assoc. Vice President, College of the Canyons – Team member

Dr. Monica Pactol, Dean of Instruction, Folsom Lake College – Team member

DATE: April 17, 2015

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Dr. Rajen Vurdien, President, Fullerton College – Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to West Valley College, April 16, 2015

Introduction:

An External Evaluation team visit was conducted to West Valley College in April, 2015. At its meeting of July 3, 2014, the Commission acted to require West Valley College to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. The visiting team chaired by Dr. Rajen Vurdien and comprised of Dr. Monica Pactol, Dr. James Temple, and Dr. Melinda Womack, conducted the site visit of West Valley College on April 16, 2015. The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the External Evaluation Team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies.

In general, the team found that the College had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the Team Chair and by assembling appropriate documents in the meeting room used by the team. Over the course of the day, the team met with the President of the College, four members of the Board of Trustees, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Academic Senate President, members of the faculty and staff, and students.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

College Recommendation 1: To satisfy the Eligibility Requirement and meet the standard, the team recommends that the college review its instructional programs with respect to the percentage of online offerings and submit a Substantive Change report to the accrediting body on programs that have equaled or exceeded the 50 percent threshold in online offerings. (ER 21; II.A.1.b; IV.A.4)

College Recommendation 2: To meet the standards, the team recommends that the College establish institution-set standards for student performance so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. (I.B.2; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.h; II.A.5; II.A.6.b)

College Recommendation 3: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College closely monitor, fully implement and evaluate the newly developed Budget Resource Allocation process to determine whether it is meeting the needs of the College and providing more transparency into the budget allocation process. (I.B; III.D; III.D.1d; III.A.6)

College Recommendation 4: To meet the standards, the team recommends that the College satisfy the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement requirement for Student Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes and regularly assess and monitor non-credit courses. (II.A; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a)

College Recommendation 5: To meet the standard, the team recommends that the College evaluate all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. (III.A.1.b)

College Recommendation 6: To meet the standard, the team recommends the District and the College ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing these learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)

College Recommendation 7: To meet the standard, the team recommends the College integrate technology planning with institutional planning, and that the College and the District develop a comprehensive technology plan for the entire organization which addresses and incorporates the needs of both instructional and non-instructional areas. (III.C.1; III.C.2)

College Recommendation 8: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College work with the District to assure continued development and support of West Valley College's physical resources, and continue to work on updating the Educational and Facilities Master Plan in accordance with the five-year timeline. Additionally, the team recommends that the Facilities and Security Council regularly meet as scheduled (III.B)

College Responses to the 2014 External Evaluation Team Recommendations

College Recommendation 1:   To satisfy the Eligibility Requirement and meet the standard, the team recommends that the college review its instructional programs with respect to the percentage of online offerings and submit a Substantive Change report to the accrediting body on programs that have equaled or exceeded the 50 percent threshold in online offerings. (ER 21; II.A.1.b; IV.A.4)

Findings and Evidence:

West Valley College successfully submitted a comprehensive Substantive Change Proposal to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) on May 19, 2014. The Substantive Change Proposal was written according to the ACCJC Substantive Change Manual 3.7.3 and included the addition of courses that constitute 50% or more of the units in a program offered through a mode of distance education, electronic delivery or correspondence education. The College received a letter of approval from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the Substantive Change Proposal on November 17, 2014. The approval included West Valley College's 66 associate degrees and 24 certificate programs that are offered at 50% or more in a distance education or electronic delivery method.

Conclusion

The College has addressed Recommendation 1 and meets all applicable standards.

College Recommendation 2: To meet the standards, the team recommends that the College establish institution-set standards for student performance so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. (I.B.2; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.h; II.A.5; II.A.6.b)

Findings and Evidence:

Through the participatory governance process, the College has taken initial steps to review, discuss, and identify the process for establishing institutional set standards and an institutional benchmarking process. A faculty coordinator for SLAPEC was identified to lead the College toward an improved institutional effectiveness structure and process and a three-year institutional benchmarking plan.

The College integrated the Student Learning Outcome and Assessment (SLO/A) and the Program Review (PR) committees into the Student Learning and Program Effectiveness Committee (SLAPEC). The SLAPEC was formalized in early fall of 2014. The intent of this committee is to enhance institutional effectiveness and further refine the college-wide integrated planning process and structure by integrating this committee into the existing Program Review process given commendation by the Commission in the External Evaluation Report from the 2014 Accreditation Self Study Team. The institutional benchmarking topic was presented and discussed in all governance committees. The SLAPEC has been charged with the development of a three-year institutional benchmarking plan.

The three-year plan has been established as follows: The College's goals for year one (2014-2015) are to establish: (1) a clear institutional framework that is in alignment with the College's annual goals and objectives; and (2) one specific benchmarking pilot goal which will be evaluated through the existing Program Review process. For year two (2015-2016), the College will focus on broader institutional benchmarks by adding categories identified in the State Scorecard and recommended by the Consultation Digest. By year three (2016-2017), the College will have completed a full cycle of institutional benchmarking.

The College goals and objectives for 2014-2015 were finalized in November of 2014. Goal 2 of the College states that the College will "decrease the achievement gap by meeting the success and retention benchmarks defined in the 2014 WVC Student Equity Plan." As part of the College's integrated planning and resources allocation model, the SLAPEC provided and distributed Program Review packets of information to the college community. Program Review submissions will be completed by April 2015.

At this time SLAPEC with work with the College researcher to review and analyze the responses to the benchmarking pilot questions. Recommendations will be made by the SLAPEC to the Student Success Team, one of the three institutional effectiveness components.

Conclusion: The College's plan for establishing set standards reflects best practices. After meeting with faculty and staff, the team understood that the college does in fact have set standards and does measure actual performance with set standards as demonstrated by data presented to team members. It was also observed that there was ample discussion among faculty and staff about the set standards and the actual results. The College has addressed Recommendation 2 and meets all applicable standards.

College Recommendation 3: College Recommendation 3: To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College closely monitor, fully implement and evaluate the newly developed Budget Resource Allocation process to determine whether it is meeting the needs of the College and providing more transparency into the budget allocation process. (I.B; III.D; III.D.1d; III.A.6)

Findings and Evidence:

The implementation of the Budget Resource Allocation Committee (BRAC) has been discussed at the Integrated Planning team and during regular BRAC meetings held throughout the year. Assessment Sessions to evaluate the BRAC occurred according to the minutes of the Integrated Planning team's November 14, 2014 meeting. As a sub-committee of the College Council, membership on BRAC includes representatives of all campus constituency groups adding a level of transparency to the budget development process. In addition, a budget development handbook was developed that includes the rubric used by BRAC to guide the budget allocation discussions (R3.15). A Budget Survey is conducted via ANGEL to document requests for additional resource allocation and ties those requests to Program Review. The resources are then entered on the annual budget worksheet that is distributed after the survey (r3.7). All constituency groups (faculty, staff, and administrators) interviewed during the follow-up visit are encouraged by the direction of the new process, its integration with Program Review, and the dialogue and accountability that now exists.

Conclusion:

The College has addressed Recommendation 3 and meets all applicable standards. A complete cycle of the Budget Resource Allocation Process is underway and there is evidence to support that evaluation of the process did and continues to occur. The process is closely monitored by the BRAC, Integrated planning team, and College Council. Modifications to improve the process continue and are ongoing. Further, the BRAC committee uses a standard rubric for the evaluation of budget requests and both clarifications of requests along with the final outcomes are communicated back to the cost centers increasing the transparency of the process.

Changing the budget development process within the context of Collegial Consultation cannot be implemented quickly and the College has shown strong progress towards full implementation since the Team visit. The college should continue to closely monitor and evaluate the Budget Resource Allocation process to ensure continued transparency throughout the budget cycle and a clear understanding of the process by the West Valley College employees.

College Recommendation 4: **College Recommendation 4: To meet the standards, the team recommends that the College satisfy the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement requirement for Student Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes and regularly assess and monitor non-credit courses. (II.A; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a)**

Findings and Evidence:

The college merged the Student Learning Outcome and Assessment (SLO/A) and Program Review (PR) committees into the Student Learning and Program Effectiveness Committee (SLAPEC). The intent of the committee was commitment to continued overall institutional effectiveness and more efficient SLO/A and PR processes as well to streamline the existing Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation process. A faculty coordinator was selected early in the fall 2014 semester to lead SLAPEC. The College currently has a total of 16 active, state approved NC courses. Five of the courses were offered and assessed in the fall of 2014 and are now included in the College's Master Program Review and SLO/A schedule. This leaves 11 outstanding NC course. SLAPEC partnered with division and department chairs to ensure that all non-credit (NC) courses and programs are assessed per the deadlines in the Master Program Review and SLO Assessment schedule. All existing NC courses offered in the fall of 2014 were assessed. New state-approved and offered NC courses are now included in

the Master Program Review and SLO/A schedule, SLAPEC has developed special reporting forms for NC courses tailored to the distinct features of the NC teaching and learning environment.

The College's institutional planning and resource allocation model includes that the SLAPEC inform Program Review and this analysis provides the rationale and needs assessment whereby the Budget and Resource Advisory Council (BRAC) can make informed and integrated resource allocation decisions.

The Master Program Review and SLO Assessment Schedule has been established for all of the College's credit and noncredit courses. SLAPEC works closely with division and department chairs to ensure that these assessments are completed according to the master plan schedule. The Follow-up Report claims that all noncredit courses offered in fall 2014 were also assessed in the same semester. According to the Master Program Review and SLO Assessment Schedule, five noncredit courses completed assessments while the remaining nine courses are scheduled to be assessed in spring of 2015.

Institutional dialog regarding SLOs in relation to improving student success has continued via conversations about teaching, learning and service by the Student Success Team, the Professional Development Committee and the SLAPEC with the college community.

SLO assessment reporting forms have been modified by SLAPEC to include a narrative section prompting programs to discuss what was learned about student learning attainment by students. In addition, the form prompts reflection of what was and was not successful, any why; as well as a plan for implementing needed change. Each program plans to meet at least once per year to address overall assessments and planned improvements. SLAPEC developed special reporting forms for the noncredit courses to address the distinct features of such courses. These forms were used in the fall 2014 assessment process. Since the Team visit in 2014, all scheduled SLOs and PLOs for spring 2014 and fall 2014 have been assessed.

Conclusion:

The College has made great strides in meeting the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement requirement for SLOs and PLOs and in regularly assessing and monitoring non-credit courses. The assessments have been made according to the Master Program Review and SLO Assessment Schedule. The overall plan shows a sincere attempt at best practices for student success. The plans for discussion of the

assessment data and needed improvements must be completed. This cycle needs to be completed as scheduled. The College has addressed Recommendation 4 and meets all applicable standards.

College Recommendation 5: College Recommendation 5: To meet the standard, the team recommends that the College evaluate all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. (III.A.1.b)

Findings and Evidence:
Findings and Evidence: As noted in the Accreditation Team Report for the 2014 visit, while the District and College have established a clearly delineated system for evaluating all personnel in the District/College, both faculty and classified evaluations were far behind schedule. The Follow-up Report indicates that past due and currently scheduled evaluations for administration, classified and faculty have been completed. Based on the tracking system for all employee evaluations provided by Human Resources, .the statements of currency are accurate. In place now is a reminder system that first, reminds the immediate supervisor of the due date for the employee evaluations. If the evaluation is not submitted in a timely manner, a second notice is sent to the immediate supervisor and copied to the supervisor's supervisor. The Office of Human Resources has indicated an improved rate of submission of scheduled evaluations.

Conclusion:

Since the initial visit, the College has done well to bring evaluation cycles up to date. Improvements in informing and tracking have significantly improved the timely completion rate of evaluations. The College has addressed Recommendation 5 and meets all applicable standards.

College Recommendation 6: College Recommendation 6: To meet the standard, the team recommends the District and the College ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing these learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)

Findings and Evidence:

In addition to the findings, evidence and conclusion reported in Recommendation 4, the College and District have made deliberate actions toward meeting this recommendation. As a result of the discussions between the District, the College, Mission College, and the leaders of the participatory governance groups regarding the best methods for solidifying the commitment to Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement of student success, both Board Policy 3200 (Accreditation) and new language in the district faculty bargaining agreement have been established, and are scheduled for Board approval this month. The new language requiring the development, implementation and assessment of SLOs will be placed in the faculty bargaining agreement and in all faculty job descriptions.

Conclusion:

A formalized plan is soon to be in place to ensure that those faculty directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing these learning outcomes. The College has addressed Recommendation 6 and meets all applicable standards.

College Recommendation 7: To meet the standard, the team recommends the College integrate technology planning with institutional planning, and that the College and the District develop a comprehensive technology plan for the entire organization which addresses and incorporates the needs of both instructional and non-instructional areas. (III.C.1; III.C.2)

Findings and Evidence:

Since the team visit in March of 2014, the District has completed a District Technology Plan which was started back in November of 2012 and identifies the technology needs of the District, West Valley, and Mission colleges. The latest draft (v22) was approved by the District's Administrative Services Council on March 4, 2015. In addition, on November 10, 2014, District Information Systems (IS) received approval to reinstate the

District Information Systems Planning and Advisory Committee (DISPAC) and held their first meeting on November 14, 2014. The committee's purpose is to address college technology issues that fall under the prevue of the District's Information Systems department and has representation from District IT, members of each College's Technology Committee, and faculty representatives.

West Valley College completed their own three year Technology Plan in January 2015. They also resurrected the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) with a new focus of assessing the technology available at West Valley. The first meeting of the TAC was held on December 18, 2014 and includes representation from all college groups.

Communication between District and College IS continues to improve with the reinstatement of DISPAC and bimonthly meetings with both groups to discuss projects and potential problems. Stronger collaboration between the areas is evident in recent projects including facilities improvements and a Virtual Desktop Infrastructure initiative involving both areas and set to roll out later this year.

Communication regarding technology needs for the campus is discussed in collegial consultation meetings, department meetings, and identified in program review. The TAC has met with the Educational and Facilities Master Plan consultants and there are plans to incorporate recommendations from the TAC along with components of the college's Technology Master Plan into this document.

Conclusion:

The College has addressed Recommendation 7 and meets all applicable standards. Both District and College Technology plans have been developed to define the instructional and non-instructional technology priorities for the college. Significant progress has been made to develop technology planning mechanisms and fully integrate technology planning with all areas of institutional planning.

To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College complete the integration of technology planning with institutional planning by ensuring the technology needs of the college are accurately referenced in the new Educational and Facilities Master Plan, and evaluating the degree to which technology planning is integrated in all aspects of planning at the college.

College Recommendation 8
To increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College work with the District to assure continued development and support of West Valley College's physical resources, and continue to work on updating the Educational and Facilities Master Plan in accordance with the five-year timeline. Additionally, the team recommends that the Facilities and Security Council regularly meet as scheduled (III.B)

Findings and Evidence:

In November 2014, the college issued contracts for an educational consulting team and architects to commence work on a new Educational and Facilities Master Plan for the college. This plan will continue the work of the 2009 plan in updating instructional and facilities needs for the West Valley campus and align with the District's Measure "C" General Obligation Bond projects passed by the voters in 2012. To keep the college community informed of the plan development process, an Educational Master Planning Website was created to provide a repository of information including minutes from various meetings with college constituent groups, introductory information about the process, and results from the college-wide survey.

The Facilities and Security Advisory Council has been reinstated with the first meeting since October 5, 2013 being held on February 23, 2015. It appears from the narrative in the follow-up report that the committee's purpose and focus have shifted from a reactive response to individual complaints to a proactive evaluation of facility and safety matters.

Conclusion:

The College has addressed Recommendation 8 and meets all applicable standards. The new Educational and Facilities Master Plan is well underway to providing a roadmap for facilities development at West Valley for the next five years. The joint participation of the District and the College in the plan's development help to ensure support for the College's physical resources.

The Facilities and Security Advisory Council is active and focused on a proactive approach to addressing facility and safety matters at West Valley College. The reinstatement of the Council further emphasizes West Valley's commitment to their facilities and the safety of the campus.