From: Bradford, Lawrence L.
To: Bradford, Lawrence L.
Subject: FW: ACCJC - 2014 Annual Report Submission
Date: Monday, November 23, 2015 6:53:18 PM

From: Bradford, Lawrence L.
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2014 5:56 PM
To: 'bradfordedd@gmail.com'
Subject: FW: ACCJC - 2014 Annual Report Submission

From: support@accjc.org [mailto:support@accjc.org]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2014 1:55 PM
To: Delahoussaye, Yasmin J.
Cc: Bradford, Lawrence L.
Subject: ACCJC - 2014 Annual Report Submission

This confirms that your 2012-2013 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Dr. Yasmin Delahoussaye <delahoyj@lasc.edu> on 03/28/2014.
Below is a copy of the information submitted. You may also re-print the report by logging on at https://www.accjc.org/annualreport.

2014 Annual Report
Final Submission
03/28/2014

Los Angeles Southwest College
1600 West Imperial Highway
Los Angeles, CA 90047

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Dr. Lawrence L. Bradford
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	(323) 241-5280
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	bradfoll@lasc.edu
5a.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.lasc.edu/students/classes-areas-of-study/documents/LASC%20College%20Catalog%202012-14FINAL.pdf
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.lasc.edu/faculty_staff/accreditation/accreditation.html
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2013: 8,301 Fall 2012: 6,964 Fall 2011: 6,613
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2013:	7,979
8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2013:	1,682

9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2013: 52 Fall 2012: 39 Fall 2011: 39
10.	Number of programs offered via distance education:	0
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2013: 1,615 Fall 2012: 1,044 Fall 2011: 938
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2013: 0 Fall 2012: 0 Fall 2011: 0
13.	Were all correspondence courses for which students enrolled in fall 2012 part of a program which leads to an associate degree?	No

Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer
14a.	What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	57.2%
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2013 semester:	60.2%
15.	Institution Set Standards for program completion: While institutions may determine the measures for which they will set standards, most institutions will utilize this measure as it is core to their mission. For purposes of definition, certificates include those certificate programs which qualify for financial aid, principally those which lead to gainful employment. Completion of degrees and certificates is to be presented in terms of total numbers. Each student who receives one or more certificates or degrees in the specified year may be counted once.	
	a. If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?	0
	b. If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	269
	c. If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	21
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	294
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	278
16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2012-2013 academic year:	23
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year colleges/universities, what is it?	115
17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2012-2013:	118
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?	Yes
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	1. CSU G.E. Certificate of Achievement 2. IGETC Certificate of Achievement
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	19
19b.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees which have identified technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other standards, including those for licensure and	19

	certification:	
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	1
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	0

20. 2011-2012 examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard	Pass Rate
Registured Nursing	51.38	state	73 %	73.3 %

21. 2011-2012 job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technology education) degrees:

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard	Job Placement Rate

22. Please list any other instituion set standards at your college:

Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard

23. Effective practice to share with the field: Describe examples of effective and/or innovative practices at your college for setting institution-set standards, evaluating college or programmatic performance related to student achievement, and changes that have happened in response to analyzing college or program performance (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

The College's Strategic Planning Committee, which includes representatives from all campus constituencies, took the primary responsibility for setting the standards. Using the PowerPoint slides from Barbara Beno's 2013 CAIR Conference presentation as a guide, the committee examined data for the past five years in an effort to identify student achievement trends over time. This led to a robust discussion that spanned over two committee meetings. In these meetings, the committee identified the issues that impacted student achievement over the previous five years (e.g. curriculum and budget changes), as well as the potential issues that the college will face ing the foreseeable future. This qualitative information was combined with the quantitative data to set the standards. To further ensure that the standards were acceptable to all campus constituencies, the standards were approved by both the Strategic Planning Committee, and the College Council.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Note: Beginning fall 2012, colleges were expected to be at the proficiency level of Student Learning Outcomes assessment (see the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III, Student Learning Outcomes). At this time, colleges are expected to be in full compliance with the Accreditation Standards related to student learning outcomes and assessment. All courses, programs, and student and learning support activities of the college are expected to have student learning outcomes defined, so that ongoing assessment and other requirements of Accreditation Standards are met across the institution.

#	Question	Answer

24. Courses

a.	Total number of college courses:	341
b.	Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	283
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	83

25. Courses

a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	36
b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	22
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	61.1

Courses

a.	Total number of student and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation):	20

26.	b. Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	20
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	100

27.	URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for programs:	http://www.lasc.edu/faculty_staff/slo/program_slos.html
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the GE program:	151
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:	70%
30.	Do your institution's GE outcomes include all areas identified in the Accreditation Standards?	No
31.	Number of GE courses with Student Learning Outcomes mapped to GE program Student Learning Outcomes:	0
32.	Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:	5
33.	Percentage of college instructional programs and student and learning support activities which have Institutional Student Learning Outcomes mapped to those programs (courses) and activities (student and learning support activities).	100%
34.	Percent of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	80%

35. Effective practice to share with the field: Describe effective and/or innovative practices at your college for measuring ILOs, documenting accomplishment of ILOs in non-instructional areas of the college, informing college faculty, staff, students, and the public about ILOs, or other aspects of your ILO practice (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

One innovative ISLO practice that was undertaken at LASC was to form interdisciplinary faculty teams to lead the campus ISLO assessment effort. For example, faculty from different disciplines used a common rubric to assess critical thinking and written communication ISLO's in different types of student work (e.g. lab reports, oral presentations, essays, etc.). This team assessed the ISLO's in their courses and then met to analyze the collective results. One interesting finding to emerge was that critical thinking scores were higher when oral presentations were assessed than when written essays were assessed. The faculty team wrote a report that was included in a campus newsletter, and was also presented at a faculty FLEX day session. This report included specific strategies for improving the ISLO scores that were based on the assessment data. The report generated a great deal of campus discussion and dialog about how to best improve campus practices to ensure that students meet ISLO's.

Each of the following narrative responses is limited to 250 words. As you develop your responses, please be mindful of success stories that can be reported in the last question of this section. We look forward to including this information from colleges in our report to the Commission and the field in June.

36. Please discuss alignment of student learning outcomes at your institution, from institutional and course to program level. Describe your activities beyond crosswalking or charting all outcomes to courses in a program (often called "mapping"), to analysis and implementation of alignment in the planning of curriculum and delivery of instruction. Discuss how the alignment effort has resulted in changes of expected outcomes and/or how students' programs of study have been clarified. Note whether the described practices apply to all instructional programs at the college (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

Course SLO alignment to Program SLOs was first accomplished as part of the 2008 Mini-Program Review process. Faculty mapped outcome evaluation within specific courses as "formative" or "summative." Later, in the 2010 Comprehensive Program Review, course SLOs were aligned to both PSLO's and ISLO's. Since that time, continued refinements to the process of aligning SLO's at the various levels has occurred. These refinements have resulted in wide discussion about how best to ensure that students gain learning outcomes when they finish a program. Further, they have resulted in discussions about how best to assess outcomes at each level. These processes apply to all instructional programs at the college.

Describe the various communication strategies at your college to share SLO assessment results for usage by internal and external audiences. Explain how communications take into account how the information is expected to influence the behavior or decisions of particular audiences. Discuss how communication of student learning outcomes assessment information and results impacts student behavior and achievement (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

SLO assessment results are posted on the college website, and are regularly discussed in SLO committee meetings. In order to ensure that the entire campus community has access to these discussions, minutes for SLO Committee meetings are posted on the college website within one week of the meeting. Further, the Public Information Officer sends regular

37.	updates to the entire campus with highlights of the meetings. SLO workshops also occur. Most recently, Dr. Robert Pacheco of the RP Group gave series of workshops for faculty, staff, and administrators. Participants brought their SLO assessment results, and discussed ways to improve both their assessment strategies, and their assessment results. Dr. Pacheco also provided web-based resources for faculty and staff to learn about different assessment methods and ways to improve assessment results. Through these various communication strategies, it is expected that faculty, staff, and students will have a full understanding of the SLO efforts that are being undertaken on campus. Further, it is expected that faculty and staff will use this information to continuously improve their SLO assessments and results. As a result, student learning and achievement will also be improved.
38.	Explain how dialog and reporting of SLO assessment results takes place at the departmental and institutional levels. Note whether practices involve all programs at the college. Illustrate how dialog and reporting impact program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words). SLO assessment results are posted on the college website, and are regularly discussed in campus SLO committee meetings. Annual program reviews are completed by department chairs, full-time faculty, and adjunct faculty, and are also posted on the college website. The annual program review includes a component on SLO assessment results, and the plans for improvement based on those results. Programs set goals for the coming year that are based on SLO and student achievement data. If a program requires additional resources to achieve its goals, it submits a resource allocation request to the college. The Budget Committee reviews all program requests using a rubric, and develops a ranked list of program allocation requests. Dependent on the college budget, these requests are then funded in rank order by the college. In the next annual program review, the program evaluates the progress made towards its goals. As a result, SLO assessment results are fully integrated into the college's planning and budget cycle.
39.	Please share with us two or three success stories about the impacts of SLO practices on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words). The Child Development Department saw 91% of it's students score 80% or higher in a learing rubric, in demonstrating that their students could show that they had learned how to prepare a lesson plan and teach a lesson to a group of children, in an early childhood setting. Conversely, the Child Development Department saw 72% of its students, score 75% or higher in a learning rubric that demonstated the students ability to display at least three (3) methods of teaching. Because the results or desired benchmark was not reached, the faculty in the department met to disucss how they were teaching the methods of teaching to students, and met with students to get their feedback and perceptions on what they were (or were not learning) and how it could be improved. As a result of these discussions,the methods for teaching to ensure that the SLO bench mark was met, has been changed.

Substantive Change Items

#	Question	Answer
40.	Number of submitted substantive change requests:	2012-13: 0 2011-12: 0 2010-11: 0
41a.	Is the institution anticipating a proposal for a substantive change in any of the following change categories? (Check all that apply)	No changes planned
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	N/A

Other Information

#	Question	Answer
42a.	Identify site additions and deletions since the submission of the 2013 Annual Report:	N/A
42b.	List all instructional sites other than the home campus where 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree is offered:	N/A
43.	List all of the institution's instructional sites out of state and outside the United States:	N/A

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting

institution.

If you need additional assistance, please contact the commission.

Sincerely,

ACCJC
10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949
email: support@accjc.org
phone: 415-506-0234