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Los Angeles Harbor College defines accreditation as an ongoing process of assessment, self-evaluation and continuous improvement. Preparation of the 2016 Self-Evaluation Report has both stimulated and strengthened this improvement-oriented continuum. The 2016 Self-Evaluation Report was approved by the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees in December 2015 and submitted to the ACCJC Commission in early January 2016; however, significant progress in several key areas has continued from then through March 2016. Recent progress is noted particularly in the areas of institutional assessment and planning and data-driven decision making. Each of these areas clearly relates to an accreditation standard (i.e., Standard I.A.2 & 3; I.B.2, 3, 4, 5, & 9; I.C.3; and II.A.3, 11, & 16) and to the College’s student success goals, as noted in the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). The progress in these areas warrants an addendum to the 2016 Self-Evaluation Report.

Institutional Assessment and Planning
Standards I.A.2, 3; I.B.2, 3, 4, 5, 9; I.C.3; and II.A.3, 11, 16

Learning Outcomes Assessment

a. The College made significant progress in implementing its third full cycle of assessment by implementing the Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS). Two Assessment workshops (December 11, 2015 and February 2, 2016) led by the college’s SLO coordinator clarified the HAPS computerized process and provided hands-on training for the 36 total participants.

b. In the Assessment workshops, the participants reviewed the development of the College’s assessment process beginning with Phase 1 (2002-2006), continuing in Phase 2 (2006-2015), and now through Phase 3 (2015 – present), which automates the existing learning outcomes assessment process and integrates it with unit planning and resource allocation. Faculty members learned how to use HAPS to record their current and future learning outcomes assessment activities and results. During fall 2015 and winter/spring 2016, faculty from all academic divisions entered assessment data into HAPS, completing approximately 700 SLO assessments that align student, program, institutional, and general education
outcomes; provide analysis; and link findings to specific improvement actions that are linked to resource allocation (2015-16 SLO-SA0 Assessment).

c. Student and Administrative Services aligned their assessment activities and measurement within the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) and the Service Areas Outcomes (SAOs). Student Services units, for example, focused this third cycle of assessment on ISLO #3-Informational and Technological Competency which allows the service area to assess its technological interface with students, the campus, and community (Assessment Results).

d. Inventories of assessment results were presented to the Assessment Committee, Division Council, and the Academic Senate. Such accounts demonstrate the increasing amount of campus participation in the assessment process. The College went from two assessments completed through November 2015 to over 700 completed by all three clusters by March 2016. This indicates that the College has moved HAPS from a pilot program in fall 2015 to a fully operational system utilized by Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services. (Assessment Results).

e. In February 2016, the Assessment Committee reviewed and approved A Guidebook for Student Learning Outcomes and Campus Wide Assessment that had been organized by the SLO coordinator. In addition to the workshops, the Guidebook further clarifies assessment alignment, the relationship to the Strategic Education Master Plan, and overall institutional effectiveness. The latter half of the Guidebook provides detailed instructions for data use. Upon approval by the Assessment Committee, the Guidebook was sent to the Academic Senate and the College Planning Council for first readings and final approval in mid-March.

Evolution of Integrated Planning Model

a. The College’s planning model has been improved since its original formulation in 2012. While all of the major elements remain, such as program review, unit plans, and annual plans, the College mission now explicitly drives planning. Data, an integral element in the earlier model, has now been integrated into an assessment-based system that includes the data, in addition to analysis, and recommendations for improvement. The College’s unit plans are directly linked to the Strategic Educational Master Plan’s (SEMP) goals and objectives
through measures and institution-set standards. Currently, the institution-set standards regarding course completion, award completion, and transfer completion are embedded in the planning modules (Completion Review Requirements). The plans now emphasize specific improvement actions rather than general resource requests.

b. The integration of planning with resource allocation is prominent. The outcomes of the earlier planning models were utilized to establish the ongoing, baseline operational budget for the College. With an established baseline budget, the College is now able to formulate a three-year financial enhancement strategy to increase revenues while reducing expenses. On an annual basis, the College plans also inform the allocation of general funds and special or restricted funds. For example, College plans are used in the prioritization for new faculty hiring from general funds. Unit plans are used in the request for Perkins funding. The College and unit plans are also the basis for allocation of Student Equity, Student Success and Support Program, and Instructional Materials funds. The revised integrated planning model strengthens the alignment of the allocation of appropriate resources to the execution of improvement actions and more robustly support the College mission.

c. This integration of planning with resource allocation is driven by the SEMP. Several goals, objectives, and measures reflect the priorities of the College for more effective resource allocation. Goal 1’s first objective is “Efficiently manage enrollment to maximize access to education.” In this objective, several efficiency measures (class size average, fill rate and FTES/FTEF) are identified for use in unit planning. Goal 4’s first objective is “Stabilize the College budget,” and both measures address the need to maintain the baseline budgets established in the 2014-2015 unit planning process while achieving the College’s growth targets.

d. Enrollment efficiency and college budget measures are built into the college’s current, assessment-based unit planning process through the Enrollment Effectiveness and Budget Management modules. Historic enrollment efficiency measures are published in the SEMP Factbook. Beginning in Fall 2015, enrollment and efficiency measures have been published and distributed through the College’s enrollment management reports [EVIDENCE] which are used to manage current term enrollment.
e. Enrollment efficiency measures were used to develop the winter 2016 class schedule. The outcome of this zero-based scheduling effort was generation of the FTES needed to achieve College growth targets while maintaining minimal FTEF expenditures (SEMP Goal 4, Objective 1, see more details below). In addition to achieving strategic priorities of the College, the winter schedule provides a proven, data-driven model for summer 2016 class scheduling.

f. Enrollment efficiency measures guided the College’s enrollment management efforts in spring 2016. Using daily enrollment management reports, low-enrolled sections were identified and cancelled, maintaining the previous spring’s section count totals. This enrollment data, and that from the fall 2015, will be used to inform decisions regarding the fall 2106 schedule.

Unit Planning

a. Units have maintained the College’s planning cycle while transitioning to the Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS). After extensive dialogue and training conducted with the HAPS pilot program in October 2015, the College Planning Council (CPC) sponsored a Unit Planning Retreat on February 1, 2016, with 41 participants from Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services. Retreat presentations and hands-on activities exemplified the alignment of unit plans with institution-set standards and the SEMP goals.

b. Evaluation of the Unit Planning Retreat produced five recommendations that were subsequently approved by CPC on February 22, 2016. The recommendations are continuously being implemented throughout the 2016 spring and fall semesters as the College further implements and integrates HAPS.

c. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has conducted numerous one-on-one training sessions as well as presentations to units in Student Services and Administrative Services. As of March of 2016, there were 928 unit plans across Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services. Among all the plans, 13.6% are linked to Access and Preparation for Success (SEMP Goal 1). Approximately sixty-four percent are linked to
Teaching and Learning for Success (SEMP Goal 2). In summary, all instructional programs and operational units are currently engaged in the process.

Data Driven Dialogue and Decision-Making
Standards II.C.2; III.D.1

a. Assessment and unit planning at Harbor College demonstrate an increased use of data, which now drives the decision-making processes.

b. In Student Services, units evaluated the assessment, orientation, and counseling (AOC) data based on Goal 1, Objective 2 in the Strategic Educational Master Plan: Access and Preparation for Success—Provide orientation, assessment and educational plans to all new students before they enroll in their first semester. As a result of this data review, Student Services sponsored Counseling, Orientation, and Assessment for Success in Transfer—COAST—Day on Saturday, February 20, 2016. This event provided a one-stop center for student to receive these vital services.

c. Data availability and usage increasingly influences the enrollment management process. Based upon analysis of data, the College realized that to meet enrollment targets for 2015-2016, it would need to offer a winter session, the first time since 2009. The College implemented data-driven enrollment management guidelines that resulted in the College offering 35 high-demand sections averaging 42 students/section and earning 177 FTES for the session. Enrollment Management reports as reflected in Goal 1, Objective 1 Measure 4 (Enrollment Efficiency) are regularly published in SEMP to facilitate the tracking of enrollment efficiencies.

d. To assist all student-serving programs, such as Harbor Advantage, CHAMPS, and EOPS, a standardized student profile is provided to each program at the beginning of the semester. The student profile consists of a summary report and a spreadsheet with student-level details. The summary report describes the students in the program by gender, age, ethnicity, current unit load, math and English enrollment, units completed, probation status, and AOC (assessment, orientation, and counseling) status. Further, the student-level data spreadsheet
provides individual student information including contact information for various counseling and outreach efforts.