



# Laney College

## Progress Report, One

### March 15, 2008



Submitted by Laney College  
900 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94607  
to  
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges  
SPRING 2008

**Frank Chong, Ed.D., Laney College President**

Elñora Webb, Ph.D., Laney College Vice President, Instruction  
and Accreditation Liaison Officer

**Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees**

Cyril Gulassa, President, Board of Trustees

Dr. Nicky González –Yuen, Vice President, Board of Trustees

Abel Guillén, Trustee

Linda Handy, Trustee

Marcie Hodge, Trustee

Dr. William Riley, Trustee

Edward “Bill” Withrow, Trustee

Marlene Hurd, Student Trustee

Reginald James, Student Trustee



## Table of Contents

I	Statement on Report Preparation	3
II	Progress Report Recommendations	4
IV	Laney College Report of Progress on Specific 2003 Visiting Team Recommendations	5
	Recommendation #2: Academic Integrity (Resolved)	5
	Recommendation #3: Laney College Strategic Planning (Resolved)	10
	Recommendation #6: Learning Outcomes Assessment (Resolved)	14
	Recommendation #7: Distance Education (Resolved)	23

## **STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION**

On June 29, 2007, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges informed Laney College and the Peralta Community College District (PCCD) that it had “reviewed the Progress Report submitted by the college and the report of the evaluation team which visited on Wednesday, April 11, 2007.” Further, the commission acted to accept the report and in an effort to assist “the college toward sustaining its forward momentum, the Commission asks that the college complete a Progress Report by March 15, 2008” on four college recommendations. The submission of this report is to be followed by a visit of Commission representatives to the colleges and the Peralta Community College District Office. This Progress Report focuses on the following college recommendations two (academic integrity), three (Laney College strategic planning), six (student learning outcomes assessment), and seven (distance education).

The team responsible for preparing and editing the sections consisted of: Peter Crabtree, Dean, Vocational Technology, Member, Learning Assessment Committee; Michelle “Cheli” Fossum, Co-chair, Learning Assessment Committee & Chair, Chemistry Department; Dr. Matthew Goldstein, Co-chair, 2007-2008 Self Study Team, Chair, English; Dr. Michael Orkin, Dean, Business, Mathematics, and Sciences & Co-chair, Technology Committee; Dr. Karolyn van Putten, Co-chair, 2007-2008 Self Study Team, Co-Chair, Academic Integrity Taskforce; and Dr. Elñora Webb, VP Instruction/Laney & Co-chair, Learning Assessment Committee.

This report was shared with the Board of Trustees on March 11, 2008, at its regular meeting.

### **Summary**

Laney College has worked earnestly to meet the expectations of the Commission by addressing each of the college recommendations. It delineates its academic integrity processes for adjudicating issues that arise in these areas for both students and faculty. It substantially implements an effective, meaningful, systematic, and comprehensive institutional strategic master plan. It is implementing its articulated process for learning outcomes assessment. It is ensuring that its’ distance education courses meet the same standards of rigor, quality, and educational effectiveness as its’ on campus courses. The resulting document provides the analysis and evidence of results for each college recommendation listed in the June 29, 2007, letter from the Commission.

Signed:

---

Frank Chong, Ed.D.  
President, Laney College

## PROGRESS REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

**Laney College Recommendation 2:** The team recommends that the College develop and publicize a clear policy on academic integrity, and delineate the processes for adjudicating issues that arise in these areas for both students and faculty. (2002 Standard IIB, 7a. & b.)

**Laney College Recommendation 3:** The team recommends that the College assign the highest priority to completing and substantially implementing an effective, meaningful, systematic, and comprehensive institutional strategic master plan. The plan must incorporate educational, fiscal, technological, physical, and human resource components, linked together with research efforts and closely integrated with the College mission statement. It should also identify short- and long-term directions for the College, timelines for implementation, individuals responsible for each area, monitoring and follow-up strategies, and expected outcomes. (2002 Standards IB.1,2,3,4, and 5. IVB 1,2)

**Laney College Recommendation 6:** The team recommends that the College articulate a process for learning outcomes assessment and begin its implementation. (2002 Standards IIA.1,2,3; IIB.3; IIC.1; III.A.B.C)

**Laney College Recommendation 7:** The team recommends that the College take steps to ensure that courses it offers through distance education meet the same standards of rigor, quality, and educational effectiveness as courses offered on campus. (2002 Standards II A.1,2,3, IIB.3, IIC.1)

## **RECOMMENDATION #2: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

The team recommends that the College develop and publicize a clear policy on academic integrity, and delineate the processes for adjudicating issues that arise in these areas for both students and faculty. (2002 Standard IIB, 7a. & b.)

### **Observations & Conclusions of the 2003 ACCJC Visiting Team**

The team concluded that “in contrast to the well defined academic freedom policy, College documents addressing academic integrity and responsibility for students do not fully define free pursuit of learning, dishonesty or misconduct; the College provides only detailed discipline and grievance policies for students. Conversely, no adjudication process exists for faculty (2003 Team Report, p. 11).

### **College Resolution of the Recommendation**

Under the leadership of the college’s Academic Integrity Taskforce, the college thoroughly reviewed and analyzed its current policies in light of the Commission’s recommendation. It identified areas needing improvement and gaps in current college policy, and carried out research and analysis of effective practices in academic integrity policies at community colleges and other higher education institutions. It then developed a new policy to address the Commission’s concerns, and published the new policies in several locations including the Laney College catalog and the Laney College Faculty Handbook. In addition, it delineated the processes for adjudicating issues that arise in these areas for both students and faculty. To emphasize their importance, the college conducted professional development activities to inform the campus community about the new policies.

### **Background and Analysis of Results**

The academic integrity principles as summarized below inform the new policy on academic integrity:

Table 1. Academic Integrity Principles Overview

<b>Core Academic Integrity Principles for Faculty</b>	<b>Core Academic Integrity Principles for Students</b>
1. Pursue truth: affirm the importance of academic integrity	1. Responsibility: strive for excellence and maintain responsibility for own education
2. Maintain high academic standards: foster love of learning	2. Honesty: present own work in accurate ways
3. Demonstrate respect: treat students as unique individuals	3. Recognize: collaborate with others and make the appropriate attributions
4. Use clear/consistent standards: promote environment of trust in the classroom	4. Support: support the integrity of source information and preserve learning materials and resources for future use by the college community
5. Provide fair/proper guidance: encourage student responsibility for academic integrity	5. Privacy: protect the security of confidential or private information
6. Establish/maintain clear expectations: clarify expectations for students	
7. Fairly assess student work: develop fair and relevant forms of assessment	
8. Adhere to academic honesty: reduce opportunities to engage in academic dishonesty	
9. Model academic integrity: challenge academic dishonesty when it occurs	
10. Affirm academic integrity standards in deeds: help define and support campus wide academic integrity standards	

The adjudicating processes for students and faculty ensure use of and adherence to the Academic Integrity Policy. Those processes focus on (1) clear academic standards and consistent use and promotion of the academic truth, respect, honesty, and excellence, (2) fair academic practices in academic guidance and assessment of student work, and (3) demonstrated academic integrity as modeled, affirmed, and ensured in faculty members' and students' academic behavior (e.g., strive for excellence; demonstrate honesty; recognize the contributions and integrity of others; support integrity of source information; and ensure privacy of confidential information)

### The Adjudication Process for Students

The adjudication process for students is explicitly published in the Laney College catalog under "Student Conduct, Discipline, and Due Process Rights," with relevant definitions, forms, and detailed steps outlined. For specific ADA matters, additional steps are outlined within the Laney College "Academic Accommodation Procedures for Student with Disabilities." These procedures ensure that rules of conduct and disciplinary actions regarding the dishonesty, abuse, disorderly conduct, theft, disruption of teaching or learning or any other area related to the five student principles (see above) are understood and used appropriately. The Laney College Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures supports these practices; they ensure students' views, concerns about fairness, discrimination, grading practices, or other academic integrity matters are addressed directly through a formal institutional process.

Class Level. The adjudicating steps begin at the informal, class level, with a faculty member identifying a possible violation, working directly with the alleged student violator to confirm the facts, then determining an appropriate response consistent with the academic integrity policy (and aligned with the expectations provided in course syllabus). If the matter requires more review and a stronger response, then the instructor of record may work with the department chair and/or dean. With this additional support if needed, the instructor establishes a meeting with the student to confirm facts and determine an appropriate response, which is dependent on the severity of the violation if confirmed. The instructor maintains her responsibility to administer an academic or disciplinary sanction (e.g., warning, lower grade, suspension), and the focus remains on facilitating student learning about appropriate versus inappropriate behaviors and the importance of adhering to academic integrity principles because they are central to student effectiveness as a learner and successful educational experiences. If the student's behavior proves to be a part of a pattern of flagrant violations to the academic integrity policy, the student shall receive an "F", be required to drop the course, be suspended, or a more extreme outcome consistent with the violation (e.g., receive a notice of expulsion).

College Level. Laney may use the formal adjudicating process of the college. Throughout the adjudication process, the student is consistently made aware of his rights to a full hearing of the facts including those of the student and to appeal at various levels. The college level process also consists of response options, with a faculty member, the president (or Vice President of Student Services), or the Board of Trustees rendering a warning or some other disciplinary decision, including sanctions. The process consists of (1) notice of charges, (2) follow up conference between student charged with the vice president of student services, and (3) an action taken among the following: "(a) the matter is dismissed...; (b) the student accepts the disciplinary action; or (c) the student does not accept the disciplinary action, and within three school days of the conference with the VPSS, the student's written notice of intent to appeal to the Student Due Process Committee is to be filed at the Office of the VPSS."

As noted earlier, the student maintains his right to appeal a decision (or to grieve if he has been improperly subjected to any disciplinary measures as stated in the policy). In the case of an appeal, specific steps are engaged that can lead to a direct appeal to the Board of Trustees. An appeal can be resolved through informal resolution or a formal hearing process with multiple adjudication options for students. Throughout this process, the rights of the student and all other parties are made clear. Guidelines for both the conduct and the academic grievance hearings are detailed as well.

Records of these transactions are maintained by the instructor and other key institutional unit such as the Office of the Vice President of Student Services based on the formal process(s) employed.

### The Adjudication Process Involving Faculty

The adjudication process addressing faculty violations of the Academic Integrity Policy is embedded within the published college supervisory and evaluation procedures. (These College procedures adhere to the Peralta Community College District Board policies, California Education Code and Title V, and they align with the policies on academic freedom and freedom of speech, student code of conduct, processes for adjudicating issues that arise for students, and the academic accommodations policy and procedures.)

When a faculty member is alleged to have violated academic integrity policy as in the case of academic dishonesty, lowering of academic standards (Board Policy 5.22 on Standards of Scholarship), using unfair assessment or grading practices, misusing source information, or violating privacy, copyright laws (Board Policy 5.17), or student fee policy (Board Policy 6.45), the supervising dean is informed of the allegation and immediately engages a fact-finding process. The alleged violator is given an opportunity to provide information. The dean maintains confidentiality while gathering facts to determine the validity of the account. Foremost, the dean maintains an environment that supports teaching and learning. If, at the conclusion of the thorough fact-finding process, strong evidence suggests (or substantiates) that a violation has occurred, then the dean establishes a meeting with the instructor. In doing so, the dean gives the instructor an opportunity to bring in a union representative or another faculty colleague as support to help clarify the facts. At this session, a review and discussion of the details occur to facilitate an understanding about the allegations and findings. Depending on the particulars of the situation, the faculty member is given the option to request more time to secure additional evidence.

If after the formal meeting(s), a conclusive finding of violation is made, then a response appropriate to the behavior is developed. If it is clear that there was not a concerted effort to violate policy, and the affect was minor, a performance improvement plan is developed with the faculty member, and an appropriate support system is provided with a follow up review(s).

In an egregious case of purposeful intent to violate the academic integrity policy, the dean shall take disciplinary action that can include a written notice of reprimand to the employee, and placing a copy in his personnel file, or in a severe case preparing a recommendation of termination of the employee. The dean may also engage other processes as outlined within the Peralta District's policies and procedures and supported by the District Employee Relations Director in compliance with applicable laws. When appropriate, a performance improvement

plan is developed with the faculty member, including an appropriate support system and provision for a follow up review(s).

Other Safeguards in Support of Academic Integrity at the Institution

The Academic Integrity Policy ensures that conditions at Laney are conducive to high quality, rigorous, and effective teaching and learning. The many safeguards established by the college and district guard against arbitrary acts such as changing grades after they have been submitted by instructors: In this example, the college and the district must receive documented evidence and a signature from an instructor verifying that a grade change is warranted. One of the most significant safeguards is the faculty evaluation process, which must be conducted systematically during defined timeframes and using the clearly identified professionals responsible for carrying out the evaluation(s), using the criteria for measuring competence in a range of academic integrity areas, and taking other necessary actions.

Through shared governance, Laney Accreditation Self Study Committee, Staff Development Committee, Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate work in tandem with Laney’s educational administrators to ensure adherence of the academic integrity principles and policy. They model the use of the official California educational code of regulations and other legal mandates as well as the district board policies, including those listed below in Table 2, to illuminate opportunities, requirements, and support systems for students and faculty.

Table 2. A Snapshot of the Key CA Ed Codes and PCCD Board Policies

	<b>Key Codes, Laws, Procedures</b> (A list of selected sections of applicable CA Ed Codes & PCCD Board of Trustee Polices and Procedures)	<b>Title V (T), CA ED Code (E)</b> (section/s)	<b>PCCD Board Policy(s)</b>
A	Civility & mutual respect		3.12
A	Academic and Intellectual freedom	T51023	5.1
A	Code of curricula or instructional standards and condtns	T51021,51022, 51964, 55002	5.15
A	Standards of scholarship	T51000,51967;E 71020,71025	5.22
F	Faculty evaluation	E87660-87683	3.30; 3.30b; 3.31
F	Copyright policy		3.06; 5.17
F	Faculty discipline (e.g., actions, hearings, suspension, dismissal procedures)	T51023.7; E87660-87683 & 87730-87740	4.41
F	Instructional materials	E78900-78907	6.55
F	Policies prohibiting employee discrimination & discrimination harassment	T51010; 53000	3.04
F	Academic accommodations for students with disabilities		5.24
S	Policy prohibiting discrimination including sexual and racial harassment and discrimination harassment toward students	T51010,51026,54220 E76240-76246	4.03
S	Student academic grievance hearing procedures		4.43a
S	Student conduct	T51023.7, 510977 E76030-76037	4.40
S	Student grievance policy	E76230-76234	4.43
S	Student records	E76230-76234, 76240-76246	4.25
S	Family Educational Rights Act of 1974	E76230-76234, 76240-76246	4.26



For example, the Faculty Senate and the Office of Instruction established the Instructional Support Committee, which leveraged its expertise to build the Basic Skills Learning Community (BSLC): a community of faculty, contract and adjunct instructors, intent on strengthening their practices. Using their partnership with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning and working with 10 sister community colleges across the State, the BSLC devised means to render transparent “closed door” teaching practices and effects on students and student learning. They did so with the explicit intent to improve the quality and rigor of their practice and student learning, ensuring academic integrity, and maintaining civility and mutual respect, all while promoting intellectual freedom. The core group of 40 faculty members has grown to include an additional 50 instructors who are now part of learning communities that are intent on maintaining the openness, critical discourse, and professional self-reflection the initiators established that facilitate academic integrity throughout the college community.

#### *Next Steps – Ensuring widespread Application of the Academic Integrity Policy*

By Fall 2009, during the Laney Professional Development series, the college will assess faculty’s knowledge and use of the Academic Integrity Policy and provide in service training on the use of the adjudication process to ensure widespread understanding and appropriate use, especially from among the new contract and part-time instructors. Laney College is reconstituting the Laney Academic Integrity Taskforce, a joint faculty and administrative leadership team, to lead this effort.

#### **Evidence of Results**

1. Policy on Academic Integrity at Laney College, adopted March 2007, 2007-2007 Laney Catalog
2. Laney Student Conduct, Discipline, and Due Process Rights Policy and Procedures
3. PCCD Board Policies
4. California Education Code
5. Title V

### **RECOMMENDATION #3: LANEY STRATEGIC PLANNING**

The team recommends that the College assign the highest priority to completing and substantially implementing an effective, meaningful, systematic, and comprehensive institutional strategic master plan. The plan must incorporate educational, fiscal, technological, physical and human resource components, linked together with research efforts and closely integrated with the College mission statement. It should also identify short- and long-term directions for the College, timelines for implementation, individuals responsible for each area, monitoring and follow-up strategies, and expected outcomes. (2002 Standards IB.1,2,3,4, and 5. IVB 1,2)

#### **Observations & Conclusions of the 2003 ACCJC Visiting Team**

The team urged Laney to increase the involvement of all stakeholders in the planning process, improve its plans reflecting its mission statement, and appropriately link all planning to resource allocation at the College and District levels (2003 Team Report, p.12-14). The team concluded that “The College should continue implementation of the strategic planning model and link the long-term goals and annual objectives with annual planning and program review results that should drive the budget.” (2003 Team Report, p. 18).

#### **College Resolution of the Recommendation**

Laney College is fully implementing a comprehensive, systematic and effective institutional strategic planning process that incorporates educational, fiscal, technological, physical, and human resource components and directly supports the core mission of the college to provide “learning opportunities in academic and career programs” and to offer “optimal student support services...to maximize access and student learning outcomes” (Laney College Catalog). The planning process identifies short- and long-term goals and directions for the college and is informed by analyses of both qualitative and quantitative data. Key priorities and objectives are established through a broadly collaborative process that flows up from program reviews and unit plans at the departmental level, through college governance committees to the administrative leadership. Strategic goals and objectives are established collaboratively by the Laney College president, administrative team, and faculty and classified leadership in collaboration with the districtwide shared governance leadership teams and approved by the Peralta District Board of Trustees. In this way, the college’s strategic planning process articulates with districtwide planning processes that result in effective district services and operational support for Laney’s primary educational mission.

#### **Background and Analysis of Results**

Responding to this key recommendation of the 2003 Visiting Team, Laney College has sharpened and continuously improved its planning processes at all levels of the institution, aligning its plans with its mission statement, its long term Strategic Directions and Goals (adopted by Laney in 2002 and approved by the Peralta District Board in 2003), its annual strategic objectives, and Peralta District strategic initiatives. To assure success of its planning efforts, Laney has streamlined, intensified, and improved educational planning processes to better inform and integrate annual institutional planning processes. Laney recognizes that effective program review is at the heart of institutional planning and improvement efforts. Goals, objectives, and plans contained in departmental program reviews and annual unit plans identify unit-level objectives and actions as well as describing the student support and resource needs of the unit which are channeled through shared governance and senior administrative reviews to inform college-level plans, strategic initiatives, and resource allocation decisions. Collegewide planning

identifies strategic opportunities and objectives and integrates educational, physical, fiscal, technological, and human resource needs analyses and resource allocation.

*Planning Cycles*

Planning processes at Laney College operate in cycles appropriate to the scope, level of effort, and timing required by the planning activity. The table below illustrates the integration of plans and planning process. The process incorporates department level and Laney and districtwide shared governance committees into district planning processes.

Table 3. Planning Overview

<b>Type of Planning</b>	<b>Time Horizon &amp; Organizational Unit</b>	<b>Informs, Informed by, and Integrates with...</b>
Unit Plan	Annual —Departments and Programs	Facilities planning, human resources planning, fiscal planning, strategic initiatives such as Basic Skills Initiative, Educational Master Plan, technology planning
Program Review	3-year —Departments and Programs	Unit plans, Educational Master Plan, long term fiscal, human resources, technology, and facilities plans
Educational Master Plan	6-year —Shared governance process led by the VPI — Intersects with district Ed Master Planning Comm.	Program reviews, unit plans, strategic initiatives, strategic opportunities and constraints, collegewide initiatives, districtwide initiatives
Fiscal Plan	Annual budget cycle and multi-year projections — Shared governance led by President and Executive Council	Base budget, unit planning, district enrollment growth targets, district revenue and expense planning, college budgeting, human resources planning, district resource allocation plan
Human Resources Planning	Annual hiring cycle — Faculty Prioritization Committee, Executive Council	Core program funding, replacement scenarios for retirements, short term and hourly hiring, program expansion plans
Technology Planning	Short and long term planning cycles — Technology Committee, Departments	Unit plans and program reviews, annual plans and cycles of technology adoption, long term IT infrastructure plans, bond fund planning
Facilities Planning	Short and long term planning cycles — Facilities Planning Committee, Departments, Executive Council	Unit plans and program reviews, Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plans, short term facilities upgrades, long term renovations, Bond fund planning
Strategic College Planning	Annual — Shared governance process led by the President	Unit plans and program reviews, Educational Master Plan, aggregation of collegewide issues and themes, districtwide goals and initiatives

Key shared governance committees include: (1) Facilities Planning Committee; (2) Educational Master Planning Committee; (3) Curriculum Committee; (4) Budget Advisory Committee; (5) Technology Planning Committee; (6) Faculty Prioritization Committee; (7) College Council (which is the highest level advisory committee); (8) Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Committee; (9) Laney College Policy Advisory Committee. Several of these committees articulate with and/or coordinate Laney planning efforts with corresponding districtwide planning committees, including the districtwide facilities committee, the districtwide technology committee, the districtwide curriculum planning committee, the districtwide educational master planning committee, a districtwide budget advisory committee, and a districtwide policy advisory committee.

#### *Program Review, Unit Planning, and Educational Master Plan*

Until 2003, Laney's program reviews were completed on a 5-year rotating basis. Program reviews were detailed, data rich, and extensively vetted by a review committee. However, recognizing the velocity of change in the current educational environment, the Laney College Educational Master Planning Taskforce concluded in 2003 that the useful life of a program review analysis for planning purposes was no more than three years and that as long-cycle program reviews aged, they became less and less effective in informing annual plans. In response, the Taskforce developed an "abridged" format for program review that retained its data richness but consumes less time to prepare and enable timely updates. Three departments piloted the new program review format in spring 2004, and all Laney College instructional units completed program reviews using the new format in fall 2004.

Building on this success, Laney College provided key leadership to create a district-adopted Accelerated Instructional Program Review specification. In Spring 2007, all instructional units at the college completed an Accelerated Program Review incorporating: (1) program mission and description; (2) report and analysis of core data elements; (3) narrative analysis of curriculum and instructional strategies; (4) program improvement needs analysis and strategies; (5) analysis of community outreach and articulation; and (6) status of implementation of student learning outcomes and assessments and analysis of student success in the program. This effort culminated with integrated planning documentation identifying department objectives, tasks, and outcomes aligned with strategic directions and institutional goals. Accelerated program reviews will be revised and updated every three years.

Complementing the accelerated program review process, a districtwide educational master planning team created an annual Unit Plan template which all of Laney's instructional units completed in Fall 2007. The Unit Plan includes an annual data review and analysis, program narrative, and identification of action steps, resource needs, and persons responsible. Unit plans are informed by annual data analyses, department program reviews, and analysis of short-term opportunities and constraints. Student services units also complete program reviews and unit plans. Categorically funded student services units complete annual reviews.

Laney's Educational Master Plan is currently being prepared. The plan will capture, aggregate, and integrate data, analyses, and themes from unit plans and program reviews, special program initiatives, educational support systems performance, results from learning outcomes and assessments, categorical program performance, distance learning, and technology planning processes. The Master Plan will identify resource allocation strategies and establish an accountability system through which strategic plans will be systematically described, implemented, evaluated, and revised.

As operationalized at Laney, program reviews and annually updated unit plans inform institutional master planning and decision-making through shared-governance and senior administrative planning processes.

### *Next Steps—Integration of Annual Strategic Planning Process*

Under the leadership of the president, the college has initiated the final steps toward development and implementation of a fully integrated college strategic planning process. Last summer a collegewide planning retreat for administrators, faculty and classified leaders was held to develop strategic plans for the academic year. Planning focused on the development of collaborative strategies to increase effectiveness in three areas vital to the college: outreach, matriculation, and retention.

In June of this year, a second leadership retreat will be held to evaluate results from the 2007-08 planning cycle and to initiate a new strategic planning cycle. Planning for the next academic year will focus particularly on unit plans and action steps. In addition, broad college planning themes will also be identified, and action plans for these themes will be developed and implemented. As this cyclical process is institutionalized, the college will annually set strategic plans, implement these plans, and evaluate the results to inform a new planning cycle.

Planning—or better, the completion of the planning cycle—has emerged as a key organizational discipline. Evidence of the planning cycle should be manifest throughout the organization, most especially at the level of each operating unit. The planning cycle is analogous to the SLO cycle: (1) setting forth learning outcomes, (2) creating assessment tools, (3) analyzing the results, and (4) designing an improvement plan. Effective planning follows a similar cycle of (1) setting annual objectives, (2) identifying measures of success, (3) analyzing year-end results, and (4) creating new planning objectives. This is the organizational discipline that Laney College is learning and practicing at all levels of the organization.

### **Evidence of Results**

1. Program reviews, Fall 2004 and Spring 2007
2. Unit plans, Fall 2007
3. Laney College Strategic Plan
4. Laney College Annual Budget Planning Cycle
5. Agendas and Minutes of Shared Governance Meetings
6. Laney College Educational Master Plan, Spring 2007
7. Agenda and Minutes of Strategic Planning Retreats
8. Laney College Catalog

## **LANEY RECOMMENDATION #6: LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

The team recommends that the College articulate a process for learning outcomes assessment and begin its implementation. (2002 Standards IIA.1,2,3; IIB.3; IIC.1; III.A.B.C)

### **Observations & Conclusions of the 2003 ACCJC Visiting Team**

The team observed that Laney College has improved shared governance and access to educational technology to enhance learning programs and increase student learning. They concluded, “The College needs to implement a process to address learning outcomes. The process should lead faculty to articulate learning outcomes for its programs, including the General Education program, and to determine ways to collect and evaluate evidence of student learning throughout program completion” (2003 Team Report, p. 18).

### **College Resolution of the Recommendation**

Laney College completed the development of a process for learning outcomes assessment in Spring 2007 and began its implementation in Fall 2007. The learning outcomes assessment implementation process required:

1. Promoting SLO/assessment discourse and understanding through faculty attendance at Statewide professional development workshops, 2004-present;
2. Creating and installing the Learning Assessment Committee as a formal shared governance body in 2005;
3. Determining with faculty the SLO and assessment priorities of Laney College using various meeting and data gathering forums, by Spring 2007;
4. Appointing a faculty leader with 50% release time to coordinate collegewide SLO and assessment training for faculty, data gathering, form development and maintenance, collaboration with the college curriculum committee, and communications efforts among faculty, staff, and administrators beginning in academic year 2006-2007 and continuing in 2007-2008;
5. Developing SLO/assessment reporting requirements, forms, a faculty handbook, and deadlines, by Fall 2007;
6. Ensuring faculty accountability for results and improvement efforts using multiple strategies including online progress reporting and review forum, incorporation of SLO progress reports into program reviews, planning and resource allocation decisions, beginning Spring 2007; and
7. Incorporating SLOs into all new and updated course outlines of record, and incorporating program SLOs into all new program descriptions. The overall process followed a timeline for developing course, program, and institutional general education outcomes, which follows.

The process for assessing course and program level learning outcomes is incremental and cyclical. The timeline for assessing outcomes began with all departments assessing course-level outcomes for all sections of one of their core courses with information collected before the end of Fall 2007 semester. Discussion of results and planning for improvement took place during Spring 2008. During Spring 2008, departments will assess more course-level outcomes. By Fall 2008, departments will assess at least one program-level outcome and more course-level outcomes. By the end of the Fall 2008 semester, departments should collect additional assessment data, reflect on the results, and use the results to make new

modifications/improvements. Departments are being reminded to perform assessments as an integral part of the update of their curriculum and program reviews. Starting in Spring 2008, some departments began reporting on their assessments, results, and improvements made using the assessment reporting forms available online: this process will be updated yearly.

In future semesters, more program and course outcomes will be assessed and discussed, and improvement plans will be created and implemented. Assessment reports for courses and programs are posted online on an internal, password-protected website.

Within student services, outcomes were developed beginning Fall 2007 with at least two outcomes assessed by Spring 2008. Part of the assessment involves a survey of users. The results will be reviewed and reflected on to determine appropriate next steps, including implementing necessary changes during Fall 2008. During Fall 2008, more outcomes will be assessed and reflected, and changes implemented by Spring 2009. This process will be repeated on an ongoing basis.

With the development of Laney College General Education outcomes in Fall 2007, the college also began planning for assessment of GE outcomes based in part on the course-embedded assessments. For each GE outcome, a pilot group of instructors will choose an assignment to assess that demonstrates that outcome. Each instructor will evaluate the assignment using a grading rubric, and collect and report on the results. The department will be asked to discuss the results and submit a simple composite report. The results will be aggregated, and a general education assessment subcommittee will evaluate the results and make recommendations. The GE assessment process will start Fall 2008. The assessment of GE outcomes may be supplemented with surveys of students or other assessment techniques.

## **Background and Analysis of Results**

### Learning Outcome Timeline

The following exhibit was created by the Laney College Learning Assessment Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate. It entails the timeline within which Laney professionals are working to develop outcomes consistent with the following:

## Exhibit 1. Laney College Timeline for Developing and Assessing SLOs

### **I. Academic/Vocational Departments**

#### **A. Course SLOs:**

- By beginning of Spring 2007, develop a set of SLOs for one core course and include these SLOs in syllabi for all sections of that course.
- By the beginning of Fall 2007, SLOs for at least eight courses should be developed and should appear in Fall 2007 syllabi for each course. If a department offers eight or fewer courses total, SLOs for all of these courses should be developed.
- Beginning Fall 2007, all new courses and course revisions that go through the curriculum committee will be required to include SLOs as an addendum.
- By the beginning of Spring 2008, SLOs for at least twenty courses should be developed and should appear in Spring 2008 syllabi for each course. If a department offers fewer than twenty courses total, SLOs for all of these courses should be developed.
- By the beginning of Fall 2008, all course-level SLOs should be completed, and the SLOs should appear on departmental websites.

#### **B. Program SLOs:**

- Beginning of Fall 2007 to mid-Fall 2007 - Departments develop program SLOs and outcomes for degrees and certificates they offer. The goal will be for all program/certificate outcomes to be complete by the end of Fall 2007. The Learning Assessment Committee will offer guidance and support for this process through holding workshops/brainstorming sessions during professional development days.
- All departments should post their completed program outcomes on their department web pages by the end of Fall 2007.

#### **C. Assessment of outcomes:**

- For Fall 2007, all departments should assess two course-level outcomes for all sections of one of their core courses. Departments should collect information before the end of the Fall 2007 semester, discuss the results, and decide on a plan for improvement to be implemented Spring 2008.
- Spring 2008 – departments should assess one or two program outcomes and a few more course-level outcomes. By the end of the semester, departments should collect assessment data, reflect on the results, and use results to make modifications/improvements (this will be an integral part of the continuous up-date of their program reviews).
- Departments should report on their assessments, results, and improvements made using a reporting template. (Starting end of Fall 2007 or Spring 2008 and updated yearly.) This template will be a key element in program review.
- This process should be cyclical. In the following semesters, more program and course outcomes should be assessed, discussed, and improvement plans should be made and implemented.
- Program review for 2009 should include evidence of the department's progress in the assessment cycle.
- The assessment reports should be available online.

#### **D. General Education Outcomes:**

- Faculty will be asked to participate in developing General Education outcomes during Spring 2007, to be completed definitely by the end of Fall 2007.
- Course outcomes in the GE programs will be checked for alignment with the GE outcomes. (Spring 2007-Fall 2007)
- Plan the assessment of the GE outcomes using course-embedded assessment. (Fall 2007) For each GE outcome, a selection of instructors will choose an assignment to assess that demonstrates that outcome. Each instructor will evaluate the assignment using a grading rubric, and collect and report on the results. The department might be asked to discuss the results and submit a simple composite report. The results will be aggregated, and a general education assessment subcommittee (for example) could evaluate the results and make recommendations. (The assessment may start Spring 2008.)
- The assessment of GE outcomes can be supplemented with surveys of students or other assessment techniques.

### **II. Student Services Units, Library, Administrative Offices (Deans, Vice President, President, Business Office), Physical Resources, Technology Resources:**

- Develop program/unit/office outcomes (whichever is applicable) by mid-Fall 2007.
- Post these outcomes on appropriate college websites. (DSPS outcomes on DSPS website, library outcomes on library website, etc.)
- Assess two outcomes by the end of Fall 2007.
- Part of the assessment must involve a survey of their users.
- Review and reflect on the results, and implement changes by Spring 2008.
- During Spring 2008, assess more outcomes. Reflect on the results at the end of the semester, and implement changes by Fall 2008.
- Repeat. (Forever!)



### Progress on Assessing Learning Outcomes

Laney is working deliberately to adhere to its process and timeline for assessing courses, programs and the GE outcomes and maintaining the momentum established. The SLO/Assessment March 2008 report to the ACCJC will show some increase in the number of courses and programs that have been assessed when compared to March 2007; yet the rate will reflect less than targeted. By Fall 2008, Laney expects a marked increase in that rate: By Fall 2008, some GE outcomes will be assessed in the appropriate courses of the college.<sup>2</sup>

The SLO/Assessment coordinator has been instrumental in this regard. She has met with many instructional and student services departments, chairs, program coordinators, instructional and student services administrators, faculty and classified leaders, and many other individuals to train them in developing SLOs, assessment plans, and assessment instruments. She has facilitated and organized a series of workshops (on developing course SLOs, developing program SLOs, and assessing SLOs) held on professional development days and other days throughout the academic year.

In collaboration with other faculty and with administrators, she carried out a number of other educational and training sessions. For example, she conducted specialized workshops for vocational programs, the sciences, and other groups. In May 2007, she facilitated a workshop on SLOs and assessment for student services. Most of the representatives that attended later developed and submitted outcomes for their programs. In Fall 2007, she provided a presentation during a meeting of the Student Services Council to explain SLOs and assessment for non-instructional programs. Student services leadership is requiring all participants to develop SLOs (II B; III A 1a, c, d). She helped facilitate for vocational faculty a retreat during Fall 2007 and a workshop during professional development day, March 6, 2008 on the assessment-improvement cycle. She regularly meets with administrators to remain abreast of developments and share information about needs and progress. Monthly and special sessions of department chairs and program coordinators are provided to increase discourse, share effective practices, and address outstanding concerns that may impede progress.

Collectively, the Learning Assessment Committee members, the Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, the vice presidents of instruction and student services, and the college deans have worked within the college and across the district to influence the curriculum development process in ways that now require submission of SLOs for all new and revised courses along with the course and program outlines. More specifically, starting Fall 2007, the curriculum committee requires an addendum for all new and revised course outlines. On this addendum, the SLOs and assessment methods for each course must be listed. New programs also require a similar addendum. These addenda must be approved by the SLO coordinator and by the Chair of the Curriculum Committee. Simultaneously, faculty are required to develop and submit assessment plans. A complete set of SLO/assessment reporting forms and reporting documents, and detailed directions for completing the forms and the learning assessment process were developed and made available for use by Fall 2007 to ensure sound development of outcomes and assessment

---

<sup>2</sup> Laney's Learning Assessment Committee has been instrumental as it has carried out its charge to develop policies and processes for the implementation and assessment of student learning outcomes. Consisting primarily of faculty, it is co-chaired by the SLO/Assessment coordinator and the Vice President of Instruction. Meeting twice monthly, it offers training and support to instructors and classified staff in developing outcomes and assessing those outcomes. The emphasis of the discussions during committee meetings has been how to move forward on all fronts: how to get more instructors in all areas of the college to work on their SLOs and assessment, how to approach GE outcomes, and how to improve the SLO/assessment process (II A 2 a, b; II B 3; III A).

practices (for review, go to <http://www.laney.peralta.edu/SLOforms>). This includes a Department SLO Summary form provided for departments to list all courses and programs and indicate whether or not each has defined SLOs and assessment methods. A rubric was also developed to help faculty use the forms. (II A 1 a, b, c; II A 2 a, b, c, d).

### Results of SLO Implementation

*Course SLOs.* Substantial progress has been made in developing course-level SLOs. SLOs for more courses have been developed since March 2007. (Details will be provided in the ACCJC March 2008 SLO/Assessment report). A current tally of the percentage of courses that have SLOs is being made and will be reported on in the “Annual Report Update on Student Learning Outcomes” in March 2008. It has become apparent that the timeline for outcomes and assessment implementation that was approved in late May 2007 by the Faculty Senate was too aggressive. In fact, the Learning Assessment Committee understood that this might be the case, yet desired to place pressure on colleagues to produce sound results in a timely manner.

*Departmental assessment of course SLOs* is another benchmark required of each instructional and student services department. Each department was required to complete an assessment plan for at least one course, submit it by October 2007, and assess two outcomes in (several sections of) one of their courses by the end of the Fall 2007 semester. Indeed, many departments did participate and turned in an assessment plan; though many plans were late. By February 2008, approximately half of the departments have turned in an assessment plan. The assessment reports on the results of the Fall 2007 assessments are due Spring 2008. This Spring 2008 semester, departments are asked to assess two outcomes in (several sections of) three of their courses: they are to submit assessment plans by March 2008 and assessment reports by June 2008. Getting all departments to comply has been challenging. In most cases, the faculty would like to comply but have had too many other urgent, time-consuming things to deal with, in addition to their regular teaching assignments.<sup>3</sup> (II A 1 a, c; II A 2 a, b, c, e)

*Program Level Learning Outcomes.* These outcomes are being created by all departments that offer degrees or certificates this academic year. The Learning Assessment Committee conducted two workshops to help faculty develop program outcomes—one during Fall 2007 and one during early Spring 2008. The instructional administrative and faculty leadership asked faculty to submit an assessment plan for one program by Fall 2008. By March 2008, the college will confirm the departments that have completed their program outcomes. All submissions are maintained online at a Laney members only site, <http://mylaney.peralta.edu>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Tasks such as completing their unit plans, dealing with renovations in their labs/classrooms, and completing their Measure A purchases. Each of these tasks requires many hours of work and this fact should be acknowledged. Many departments have expressed a wish to start and/or continue with the SLO/assessment process but have lacked the time to devote to it.

General Education Outcomes. Laney engaged the college community in discussion of general education outcomes, and developed the comprehensive set of Laney College GE outcomes Fall 2007 (revised and approved Spring 2008) as identified below in Table 4 (II a 1, 2, 3 a, b).

Table 4. General Education Outcomes

General Education Requirements & Key Educational Priorities		Outcome(s)
Area 1	Natural Sciences	Apply the principles, concepts, and/or methods of the natural sciences to everyday life.
Area 2	Social and Behavioral Sciences	Critically analyze personal experiences within the context of historical, cultural, and environmental phenomena.
Area 3	Humanities	Investigate and appreciate the fine arts and humanities, including the cultural and artistic perspectives of various cultures and times.
Area 4a	English Composition	Develop individual perspectives in essays that demonstrate critical thinking skills, command of standard grammar, and logical organization.
	Information Competency (assessed with English Composition)	Locate and cite appropriately information from a variety of sources (books, databases, internet, primary sources) in various formats (print, online, multimedia); evaluate information for relevance and reliability, and incorporate it effectively into written work
Area 4b	Mathematics	Solve quantitative problems using numerical, graphical, and algebraic methods.
Area 4c	Computer Literacy	Demonstrate proficiency in using a computer and computer applications, including the Internet to accomplish personal, academic, and/or professional tasks.
Area 4d	Oral or Written Communication or Literature	Construct and deliver a clear, well-organized verbal presentation. OR: Organize information coherently in writing, and choose language and format appropriate for the intended audience and purpose. OR: Read critically and analyze various literary genres.
Area 5	Area 5: Ethnic Studies	Critically evaluate the historical and contemporary experiences of African Americans, Mexican/Latino Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, or Native Americans using interdisciplinary approaches.
	Ethics/Citizenship	Demonstrate an increased awareness of ethical behavior, civic and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

The Process Used to Develop GE Outcomes. April 26, 2007, Laney College held a collegewide retreat to discuss and determine what Laney College's general education outcomes would be. This retreat was purposely scheduled to ensure that no conflicts existed. The facilitators used a handout with background information and examples of GE outcomes from different institutions. Participants split into two working groups: academic and vocational. Each group looked at the examples and discussed which general model seemed to be appropriate and appealing. The groups reconvened and shared the results of their discussions.

In May 2007, the Learning Assessment Committee reviewed the notes of this retreat and decided on a general approach: that we would base our GE outcomes on our GE requirements. It was decided that the college would convene working groups of faculty to decide on one common outcome for each GE area that would apply to any course within that area. Implemented Fall 2007 semester, the results of this plan are eight general education requirements. Each outcome results from a GE pattern-specific faculty group that convened for this purpose. (For example, science faculty met to develop the Natural Sciences outcome.) The participants were given some background information and a list of possible outcomes gleaned from other sources. Each group developed one outcome statement that seemed general enough to apply to any course in that area. In this way, the process built in the "mapping" of each outcome to a set of courses. Laney decided to use course-embedded assessment of each outcome, and added information competency, civic responsibility and ethical values to the list of GE outcomes.

Laney College continues to make the GE outcomes public in various venues, including online on the Learning Assessment website, on college posters, in the Faculty Senate lounge, and in the department chairs and program coordinators meeting places. (See [www.laney.peralta.edu/GEoutcomes](http://www.laney.peralta.edu/GEoutcomes) for details.) Comments and revisions were requested from the entire college community via e-mail and campus mailboxes. The draft outcomes were modified based on the comments received. The revised outcomes have been approved by the curriculum committee as of February 26, 2008. The Faculty Senate approved them on March 18, 2008. Laney expects to pilot the assessment of at least three of the GE outcomes by Fall 2008: it remains to be seen whether this is too ambitious (evidence consists of handout and notes, II A 3).

To increase dialog and momentum Laney is publicizing course and program level outcomes in diverse ways including the Laney "Eagle Flies" newsletter, Laney website, Office of Instruction communiqués, Learning Assessment Committee notices, Curriculum Committee agendas and Faculty Senate meetings. By doing so, Laney is engaging more faculty in "inclusive, informed, and intentional dialogue" about how to assess, collect, and evaluate evidence of student learning. Thus, the college has ratcheted up reflections and discourse on institutional quality, improvement, and integrity with specific focus on delivery methods, pedagogy, adult learning processes, and other essentials to engaging learners effectively. A diverse set of standards of good practices are employed to facilitate efficient and sound achievement of the tasks outlined in the SLO/assessment plan (see pages 19-22 of the Spring 2007 Laney College Progress Report).

For details about documents communicated and collected, go to the Laney Library and the websites listed in Table 4 (II A 1; II C).

Table 4. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Websites

A	<b>Laney College Learning Assessment Committee website</b> <a href="http://www.laney.peralta.edu/learningassessment">http://www.laney.peralta.edu/learningassessment</a>
B	<b>How to Write SLOs website</b> <a href="http://www.laney.peralta.edu/SLOs">http://www.laney.peralta.edu/SLOs</a>
C	<b>SLO Forms website</b> complete with the forms and directions for completing them <a href="http://laney.peralta.edu/SLOforms">http://laney.peralta.edu/SLOforms</a>
D	<b>GE Outcomes website</b> <a href="http://www.laney.peralta.edu/GEOutcomes">http://www.laney.peralta.edu/GEOutcomes</a>
E	<b>SLO/Assessment Reporting &amp; Recordkeeping website.</b> <a href="http://mylaney.peralta.edu">http://mylaney.peralta.edu</a> In internal (Laney-only) website was developed as a place to store all of the assessment information we have. SLOs, assessment methods, assessment plans, and assessment reports are all being stored on this website. As departments complete SLOs, assessment plans, or assessment reports, they send them to the SLO coordinator for approval. The SLO coordinator reviews them and either approves them or gives suggestions for improvement. Once approved by the SLO coordinator, the items are posted on this internal website. In this way, our assessment efforts are being documented. Evidence is found on the Peralta website, which requires a login address and password. <i>Alpha listing of all reports by department. Login and password required to access all documents.</i>

The student learning outcome assessment effort at Laney College ensures the preconditions necessary to achieve the college mission and uphold its integrity. The results of the assessments are being used to improve courses, programs, and the college’s offerings, and make sound resource allocation decisions (see Recommendation 3, Laney College Strategic Plan discussion for more information).

This college-wide SLO/assessment effort has been reinforced by the work of other key groups on campus, including the Curriculum Committee, Instructional and Student Services Councils, Basic Skills Learning Collaborative Reflective Inquiry Group, and the Instructional Support Committee of the Faculty Senate.

In summary, the process for learning outcomes assessment is being developed and implemented with an on-going focus on training, review and dialog. Some departments are behind in fulfilling assessment tasks. This suggests more aggressive incentives and other support are needed as well as reasonable pressure from supervisors to ensure realistic progress. Progress will accelerate as more faculty realize that the SLO assessment process is not a new burden but rather is a more objective and self-aware process for doing what professional faculty members do routinely anyway, i.e., continuously improve instruction for better learning results.

*Next Steps – Full Implementation of the Learning Assessment Process*

As Laney faculty gain increased expertise and comfort with the SLO assessment cycle, there is growing confidence and evidence to suggest that the college will continue to gain momentum in implementing plans as scheduled and complete the full cycle of outcomes assessment and improvement at the course, program and GE levels.

## **Evidence of Results**

1. Learning Assessment Websites (see Table 4 above)
3. Laney College Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Manual
4. Laney College Learning Assessment Committee Agendas and Minutes
5. District Staff Development Plans of Spring 2004, Fall 2005, Spring 2006, Fall 2006, Fall 2007
6. College of Alameda, Berkeley City College, Laney College, Merritt College Principles of Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes: A Peralta Community College District Memorandum of Understanding, May 2006
7. Laney College Faculty Academic Senate Adopted SLO Implementation Plan, Spring 2007

## **LANEY RECOMMENDATION #7: DISTANCE EDUCATION**

The team recommends that the College take steps to ensure that courses it offers through distance education meet the same standards of rigor, quality, and educational effectiveness as courses offered on campus. (2002 Standards II A.1,2,3, 11B.3, IIC.1)

### **Observations & Conclusions of the 2003 ACCJC Visiting Team**

The team recognized the growing interest of faculty in distance education and Laney College's knowledge of the need to "ensure the quality of distance education offerings and...to develop processes and practices to ensure that quality" (2003 Team Report, p. 16).

### **College Resolution of the Recommendation**

Laney College has taken steps to ensure that courses it offers through distance education meet the same standards of rigor, quality, and educational effectiveness as courses offered on campus. The standards, educational practices, and review processes of the college ensure this result.

Formalized and institutionalized in the college's course evaluation and planning procedures, the Laney Curriculum Committee has established a special requirement for all existing as well as new distance education classes in which a "Distance Education Addendum" to Course Outlines must be prepared and separately reviewed and approved before any Laney course can be delivered through distance education. The addendum includes information regarding the form of distance education; need/justification; plan for instructor-student contact; SLO, assignments, and assessment comparisons with on-campus version of course; modes of instruction; technical issues; accommodations for students with disabilities; and additional resource needs. Thus, the college has acted to ensure that no distance education course can be offered without full scrutiny and quality assurance with the curriculum committee and appropriate administrator.

### **Background and Analysis of Results**

In addition to the distance education course outline addendum and quality assurance process required by the college, all other standard evaluation and planning processes used to review online courses for quality and integrity are the same as for any traditional method of course delivery. This consists of curriculum review and program review processes, which require completion every three years. Following the completion of program reviews, unit plans are developed which identify the steps for improving and enhancing the rigor and quality of courses and programs. (These processes are documented in the Laney College Curriculum Committee, Districtwide Council on Instruction, Planning, and Development (CIPD) review and approval processes, the Laney College Program Review Guidelines, and the CSEP Unit Planning Guidelines).

A preliminary study of student data found comparable outcome results in terms of enrollment, productivity, and retention data, and a slightly better success rate for distance education classes compared to on campus classes. This result may be in part due to the online learning resources Laney makes available to all students through library and other learning support services.

Service centers of the college offer online students a variety of academic resources. For example, the Laney Library offers access to a variety of electronic resources, including the library catalog, full-text databases and locally-developed web pages designed to provide research guidance and enhance instruction. The library catalog provides fully-cataloged access to the entire library collection, including online links to the table of contents for many newer titles and

direct live links to listings of special collections within the library. (Examples include: video/DVD titles, easier to read library materials and cookbooks for the culinary program.) In addition, the library subscribes to twenty-eight full-text online databases. In 2008-2009, the library plans to add an electronic book collection with access to individual titles incorporated into the online library catalog. Most of the databases are accessible off-campus with a user/password list provided by the library. The library is now in the process of establishing remote authentication for all databases through a proxy server. This will eliminate the need for a password list. Librarians work closely with discipline faculty to ensure that appropriate online library resources are available for distance education (DE) students. With the recent hiring of a Media/Instruction Librarian, the library has embarked on several other distance education initiatives including the development of an online library video tour and an online version of the library's core course, Library and Information Studies 85.

*Additional Steps Taken to Ensure Rigor, Quality and Educational Effectiveness for DE Offerings*

1. Laney College prepared a draft document "Distance Education Standards and Practices" for districtwide adoption to provide a set of standards, a broad framework, and measurable goals for DE at the college and districtwide. An early draft was completed in early Fall 2007 ("Online Education Discussion Paper") and led to the development of the districtwide draft "Distance Education Standards and Practices" document. When fully adopted, these standards will provide an additional layer of quality assurance for distance education throughout the Peralta District
2. The college established a planning process for DE through the Laney Technology Committee. Included in this process are benchmarks to ensure that well-prepared DE faculty members meet the motivational and learning needs of students.
3. Recognizing the need to broadly assure quality in all distance education courses, the college created a DE philosophy that ensures Laney complies with accessibility and usability guidelines and requirements. Also, it ensures an increase in community access to education, the number of qualified online instructors, and inter-campus collaboration. Furthermore, it promotes the use of state-of-the-art online technology that is integrated with online student services programs.
4. The college developed evaluation criteria that spell out the processes for testing Learning Management Software and other incubator projects.
5. The college addressed accessibility and usability standards to support ADA physical guidelines and guard against test biases while meeting requirements.
6. The college developed a comprehensive set of quantitative and qualitative goals that distance education efforts must follow. (Completed first draft.)
7. The college is committed to supporting instructional deans as they work directly with department chairs and other faculty members to discuss the efficacy of DE classes and to update course outlines to reflect effective curriculum and instruction. Such efforts will be reinforced by faculty leaders and appropriate shared governance committees



8. The college will continue to improve its process for considering new programs or educational initiatives. The curriculum committee established an “educational program development process”, which models the new State standards for new degree and certificate courses. The Laney Technology Committee is co-chaired by a Laney counselor and an instructional dean. This shared governance committee is helping shape the Laney and district distance education policy. The resulting Spring 2008 survey that is being administered collegewide to the faculty and staff by this team was developed to help produce the district wide DE plan.
9. The college and district are committed to improving distance education technologies. The aim is for one portal to access all Peralta colleges’ distance education courses with one common learning management system and a coordinated, districtwide online help desk to achieve economies of scale and provide thorough online assistance.
10. The college will seek to obtain sufficient funding to expand its online education programs and adopt the best practice of California community colleges with successful DE programs (e.g., Santa Monica College, Foothill College, San Diego Community College District, and Los Angeles Community College District).
11. The college will seek to develop strategies to improve online access, especially for low-income students, establish Laney as a fully wireless campus, and attempt to obtain low-cost laptops for economically disadvantaged students.

#### *Meeting the ACCJC DE Standards*

In the systematic review of the ACCJC standards 4D2, 4D6, and 4D7, the Laney faculty and administrative team determined that each aspect of the standard is being addressed through the curriculum review, program review, unit planning, educational master planning, and institutional evaluation processes. The ACCJC “Distance Learning Manual” (August 2007) has served as an important guide to developing the Laney DE review, steps taken, and planning work.

#### *Next Steps –Continue to improve the overall quality, rigor, and effectiveness of DE*

The convenience and expanded access for students that DE makes possible have made DE a strategic priority of the college. This is reflected in the Laney College Strategic Plan and is a key priority being developed within the 2008 Laney College Educational Master Plan. As Laney continues to build its DE program through 2010, with expanded online offerings as well as infrastructure improvements to online course delivery capacity, it intends to ensure that faculty members are well trained, that academically rigorous online programs are developed, and that online courses fit its strategic plan. In conjunction with this effort, Laney will increase marketing efforts to effectively reach DE target populations by including DE course promotion in PCCD marketing material (target populations include students with scheduling difficulties, students within district who can not come to campus, students out of district, etc). As part of this marketing effort, Laney will continue to post schedules of online classes on Peralta and college web sites.

In the future, Laney will continue an ongoing system of evaluation of DE offerings to assure currency and measure achievement for all courses, certificates, programs and degrees. This system will be part of a comprehensive plan that includes a process for delivering and discussing results and a training program for faculty and other professionals involved in DE (II A 2 e, f, g; II B 3 b, c).

### **Evidence of Results**

1. Laney College Curriculum Committee: Distance Education Addendum
2. Office of Instruction: Updated Course Outlines, Fall 2006, Spring 2007, Fall 2007
3. ACCJC/WASC Distance Learning Manual
4. Laney College Distance Education Report, Fall 2007
5. Laney College Educational Master Plan
6. Laney College Program Review Guidelines
7. CSEP Unit Planning Guidelines
8. Laney College Distance Education Standards and Practices (draft document)