EVALUATION TEAM REPORT

West Hills College
Lemoore, California

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the Evaluation Team that visited
West Hills College – Lemoore on March 6 – 9, 2017

Angela R. Fairchilds, Ph.D.
Chair

NOTE: this page shall be added to the team report noted below, immediately behind the cover page, and shall become part of the final evaluation report associated with the review.

DATE: June 23, 2017

INSTITUTION: West Hills College Lemoore
                                        555 College Avenue
                                        Lemoore, CA 93245

TEAM REPORT: Comprehensive Evaluation Report

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited College March 6 – 9, 2017.

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

The comprehensive External Evaluation Report provides details of the team's findings with regard to the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies, and should be read carefully and used to understand the team's findings. Upon a review of the External Evaluation Report sent to the College, the College's Self-Evaluation Report, and supplemental information, oral testimony evidence provided by the College and the District, the following changes or corrections are noted for the Team Report:

1. Change District Recommendation 2 to a Recommendation to meet Standards (Compliance Recommendation)

West Hills College Lemoore
External Evaluation Visit Team Roster
Monday, March 6-Thursday, March 9, 2017

Chair	**Assistant**
Dr. Angela Fairchilds	Ms. Cari Craven
President	Executive Assistant
Columbia College	Columbia College

Dr. Bertha Barraza
Associate Professor/Counselor
Mt. San Jacinto College

Dr. Deborah Nolan
Faculty Distance Education Coordinator
College of the Sequoias

Ms. Roanna Bennie
Vice President of Instruction
Las Positas College

Ms. Kimberly Nickell
Professor Academic Development and
Student Success Lab Coordinator
Bakersfield College

Mr. Jonah Nicholas
Associate Vice Chancellor/CFO
Contra Costa CCD

Mr. Ed Knudson
Superintendent/President
Antelope Valley College

Dr. Julianna Barnes
President
Cuyamaca College

Dr. Howard Irvin Jr.
Vice President, Student Services
Los Angeles Southwest College

Dr. Janet Fulks
Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
Bakersfield College

Mr. Georg Romero
Library Director
Cabrillo College

Dr. Aeron Zentner
Dean of Institutional Research, Effectiveness,
and Grant Development
Coastline Community College

Ms. Linda Wah
Trustee
Pasadena City College

Summary of Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: West Hills College – Lemoore

DATES OF VISIT: March 6, 2017 – March 9, 2017

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Angela Fairchilds, President – Columbia College

An evaluation team comprised of fourteen member visited West Hills College Lemoore March 6 through 9, 2017, for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on December 1, 2016, and conducted a pre-visit to the college and, as chair of the District team, to West Hills Community College District Office on January 9, 2017. During this visit, the chair met with the college leadership to prepare and discuss logistics for the team visit. On January 19th, four members of the team attended the ACCJC training in Los Angeles. At that time, the team was not yet fully staffed. Prior to the visit, each team member completed and submitted to the chair a survey of professional expertise and accreditation experience, an analysis of the Institution Self Evaluation Report, and a written overview of their Standard Team assignments.

On Monday morning, March 6, the chair and several members of the team were designated to join members of the Coalinga team on a visit to the West Hills Community College District Office to conduct interviews with the Chancellor, Trustees and District staff.

The full team arrived in Lemoore mid-afternoon and traveled to the college for a team orientation meeting, a welcome reception with College constituents, and a campus tour. The work of the team began in earnest on March 7, with full days on campus Tuesday and Wednesday.

The team reviewed a myriad of materials in print and electronically, including documents and evidence supporting the Eligibility Requirements, Standards, Commission Policies and USDE regulations. Other evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, institutional plans, program review processes and reports, student learning outcomes assessment evidence, DE classes, WHCCD policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and information related to the governance structure and processes. The team was provided access to the internal college portal and BoardDocs sites.

During the visit, the team met formally with individuals and groups totaling 235 people, and had numerous informal conversations with students, faculty and staff. The two open forums were

well attended with approximately 50 people at each, including students, community members, faculty, and staff. We heard many positive comments about the campus culture, the student centered focus, and the value of the college as an asset to the community at large.

Thursday morning was spent in the team room discussing findings, drafting commendations and recommendations, and finalizing the written work of the standards teams for the draft report.

The team found a very welcoming and collegial atmosphere and a dedicated staff and faculty with deep commitment to student success. Additionally, we found the college was open and honest about areas where improvement is needed, as evidenced by the topics in the Quality Focus Essay---Enhance the use of data, outcomes, and assessment for continuous improvement, resource allocation, and strategic planning, as well as to improve communication. We concur with the need for the college to strengthen in these areas and have offered suggestions toward their efforts, particularly the need to revisit the timeline for accomplishing the anticipated outcomes.

The team's assessment of the College's Institutional Self Evaluation Report was that it addressed all of the Eligibility Requirements and the Standards but that some areas lacked sufficient evidence. Requests to the College for additional supporting evidence and materials were met promptly. The College made us welcome and comfortable in the Team Room with good access to technology and on-call IT support. Scheduling of interviews and other meetings was handled very efficiently and all interactions with staff were positive.

Team members were frustrated with the poor internet access at the hotel which impeded our ability to work away from the campus.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2017 External Evaluation Team

District Commendations
As a result of the March 6 through 9, 2017 visit, the team noted two district commendations:

District Commendation #1
The team commends the District Information Technology department for its dedication, commitment, and responsiveness in effectively serving the colleges and sites over a geographic area of nearly 3,500 square miles.

District Commendation #2
The team commends the District for investing in the professional development of its workforce. In the establishment of the Employee Scholars Program, the District has made clear its commitment to the educational advancement of its employees by investing up to $3,000 annually per participant.

District Recommendations for Compliance and Improvement
As a result of the March 6 through 9, 2017 visit, the team noted two district recommendations:

District Recommendation #1 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the district update the evaluation instrument of academic administrators to formally include the use of results of learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. (Standard III.A.6)

District Recommendation #2 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a long term plan for the systematic review and revision of all Board policies and establish a formal process for documenting the review of policies in which no revisions are made. (Standard IV.C.7)

College Commendations
As a result of the March 6 through 9, 2017 visit, the team noted five college commendations:

College Commendation #1
The Team commends the College for its commitment to faculty development initiatives to support improvement of online and face-to-face teaching and learning, specifically the Connected Learning Lab; the College Teacher Trade-n-Talk (T-n-T) program; and the Innovate Days Faculty Summer Institute.

College Commendation #2
The College is to be commended for its commitment to the guiding principle of the "relentless pursuit of student success" which has been translated into action through engagement with the Achieving the Dream initiative and through innovative practices such as Student Success Teams, Reg365, and the "15 and 4 in 4" campaign.

College Commendation #3
The Team commends the College for its vision and work in establishing the new Golden Eagle Student Union. The facility provides a popular gathering space that supports student government and leadership and provides opportunities for faculty and student engagement.

College Commendation #4
The Team commends the College for establishing close partnerships with local industries and articulating its certificate programs to the needs of the regional employers and creating opportunities for student internships.

College Commendation #5
The College is to be commended for fostering a culture of innovation and creating strong community and student support programs through a collegial environment of problem-solving and decision-making.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

As a result of the March 6 through 9, 2017 visit, the team noted six college recommendations:

College Recommendation #1 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College continue to strengthen institutional capacity to analyze data for: continuous improvement; resource allocation and planning; and to effectively address the goals and achieve the anticipated outcomes defined in the Quality Focus Essay. (Standards I.A.2, I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, III.D.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.6, IV.B.3, IV.D.6)

College Recommendation #2 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the college develop and implement a coherent integrated model that clearly connects the use of data, outcomes, and assessment to planning and resource allocation to effect improvements. (Standards I.B.I, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.8, ER 11)

College Recommendation #3 (Compliance)
In order to meet the Standard, the Team recommends that all program outcomes be assessed and become part of the SLO cycle, and the SLO Committee facilitate the work of mapping, assessing, analyzing and using for improvement the Institutional Learning Outcomes. Additionally, the results of Program Level Outcomes and Institutional Level Outcomes should be integrated into institutional planning and resource allocation. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, II.A.3, II.A.11)

College Recommendation #4 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness, the Team recommends that the College publish Program Learning Outcomes for all programs, ensure all syllabi identify established Course Learning Outcomes, and establish regular and planned evaluation of processes for continuous improvement. (Standards I.C.1, I.C.2, II.A.3, ER 20)

College Recommendation #5 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends the college strengthen the analysis and planning around student achievement between face-to-face and online course sections and use the data to develop and implement strategies to improve student achievement. (Standard II.A.16)

College Recommendation #6 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness and to more clearly delineate college level budget autonomy, the Team recommends that the College should have sufficient personnel knowledgeable in financial resources to: effectively interface with District Business Services on behalf of the College; enhance transparency related to budget and purchasing transactions and decisions; articulate complex financial information to College staff; assist with local budgetary issues; perform intricate analysis to aid in the overall financial management of the College. (Standards III.A.9, III.D.2, III.D.5)

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT
FOR
WEST HILLS COLLEGE – LEMOORE

Introduction

The West Hills Community College District (WHCCD) was founded in 1932 as the Coalinga Extension Center for Fresno State College. In the 1940s, Coalinga College ended formal ties with Fresno State and came under the control of the Coalinga Union High School District. In 1961, the school separated from the high school district and, in 1969, became known as West Hills College. Courses were offered in Lemoore as early as 1962, and a physical site was established on a 5-acre parcel in 1981. The site became the Kings County Center and operated in that capacity for 20 years. Population growth in the area called for a much larger site to meet future needs and, after a search for suitable space, the WHCCD Board of Trustees accepted a donation of land of approximately 100 acres from two local families.

West Hills College Lemoore (WHCL) opened at its present site in January, 2002 and began the process to attain full college status. The College was granted initial accreditation in 2006 by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, becoming the 109th community college in California and transforming West Hills into the multi-college structure it is today - West Hills Community College District.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority: The evaluation team confirmed that West Hills College Lemoore is authorized to operate as a post-secondary, degree granting public institution based on its accredited status initially conferred by the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 2006 and reaffirmed in 2011. The college also operates as part of the California Community College system and is authorized to provide educational programs according to the California Education Code.

The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

2. Operational Status: The evaluation team confirmed that the College is operational and provides educational and support services to approximately 6,200 students annually, which reflect in nearly 24,000 enrollments in degree applicable credit courses. Approximately 80% of students are degree, certificate, and/or transfer-seeking and 40% of students enroll full-time with 12 or more units.

The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

3. Degrees: The evaluation team verified that the College offers a total of 56 Associate of Art, Associate of Science, and Associate for Transfer degrees. In 2015-16, the College offered 914 course sections, with 879 (96.2%) being identified as degree-applicable.

The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer: The evaluation team verified that the President serves as the CEO of the college, with 100% full-time responsibility to the Institution, and is not a member of the Board of Trustees. Further, the job description of the college President is published, and specifically delineates responsibilities of the CEO to "plan, organize, administer, review, and evaluate programs for the assigned college and centers." The current College President was appointed at the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees on September 22, 2015, with an effective start date of January 1, 2016. This change of leadership was reported to the ACCJC at that time.

The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

5. Financial Accountability: The evaluation team confirmed that the College engages a qualified audit firm to conduct audits of all financial records. All audits are certified and all explanations or findings are documented appropriately.

The team affirms that the College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

Checklist for Evaluation Compliance with
Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

⊠	The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
⊠	The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
⊠	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

⊠	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The team found evidence that the college made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit in the "Announcements" section on the college website and event calendar. Information pertaining to student and public complaints and a hyperlink to the ACCJC Third-Party Comments webpage is accessible on the site. The team confirmed that no third party comments were made through ACCJC or from the December 6, 2016 Board meeting, in which third-party comments were placed on the Board of Trustees agenda. Several community leaders attended both open forums to speak in support of the college and its service to the community and local industry.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

⊠	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.
⊠	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each

	instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
☒	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
☒	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team verified that the college has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution and has established institution-set standards. The college uses institution-set standards and key performance indicators to measure and assess student achievement and progress towards college goals – WHCL Institution-Set Standards Data 2016. Program reviews incorporate success, persistence, and completion rates to assess and evaluate institutional effectiveness and priorities. The president confirms all college processes. The West Hills Community College Board of Trustees and the College Planning and Governance Council review institutional performance standards for student achievement annually. Achievement standards are guided through the college strategic planning process and key performance indicators. Campus leaders are held accountable for ongoing continuous improvement, reporting, and corrective action as needed. Job placement rates are routinely and regularly reviewed through the program review process.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

☒	Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).

☒	The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
☒	Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
☒	Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team verified that the credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education shown on the Course Outline of Record (COR). As outlined in the Curriculum Handbook - course credits are assigned based on the number of lecture or laboratory hours and other performance based criteria specified in the course outline of record. Tuition fees are outlined in the college catalog. WHCL does not offer clock hour programs. The team verified that the institution is compliant with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

☒	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
☒	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
☒	The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team verified that Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and the public through their college catalog, and transfer-planning assistance is available through the WHCL Transfer and Career Center. Transfer policies are in the college catalog including information about how the college accepts credit for transfer. The team verified that the institution is compliant with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
☒	There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
☒	The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
☒	The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
WHCL offers online and hybrid courses, but does not offer correspondence courses. The institution has a Distance Education Strategic Plan and Curriculum Handbook that determine methodology and assessment for DE. Student user accounts are used to login to WHCCD computers, myWestHills (Colleague) portal, and Canvas (Learning Management System). Passwords are governed by an enforced standard requiring both length and complexity. The distance education infrastructure also includes EvaluationKit for course evaluations, Cranium Café for online collaboration and student services support, and NetTutor for online tutoring. In addition, the District's Connected Learning division provides a professional development lab, workshops, and supports the online faculty community. Online students receive academic support in several forms. An online student orientation is available through the student portal for those unable to participate in face-to-face orientations. Online tutoring is available through NetTutor and the WHCL library houses online resources and databases. The team verified that the institution is compliant with the Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
☒	The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
☒	The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
☒	The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and govern mental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to

	meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team verified that WHCL has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and that current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online. A review of the student complaint files, in both paper and electronic format, confirmed complaint policies and procedures are accurately implemented. The team further verified that the college is compliant with Commission policies on Representation of Accredited Status and Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
☒	The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.
☒	The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on <u>Student Complaints</u>.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1))(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team verified that WHCL provides student and the public information pertaining to its programs, locations, and policies through the college catalog, schedule of classes and website. The team also verified that the college accurately publishes its accreditation status on the college website and in the catalog.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
☒	The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
☒	The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
☒	Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
Evidence provided in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ER 5; II.B.4; III.B.4; III.D 5-7, 10, 14-16) demonstrates the College complies with Federal Title IV regulations and maintains its student loan default rates within the acceptable range defined by the USDE.

Standard I:
Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

Standard I.A.: Mission

General Observations:
West Hills College Lemoore (WHCL) has a clearly defined mission statement that describes the institution's broad educational purposes: quality courses leading to certificates, associate degrees, transfer, and career pathways. The mission statement addresses the intended student population, described as "….*students who seek affordable, accessible, relevant and rigorous education*", and indicates a commitment to student learning and achievement. The institution's instructional programs are aligned with its mission statement through a variety of processes and cyclical improvement cycles. The WHCL mission statement is widely published and posted across the campus in classrooms, conference rooms, offices, the library and other gathering spaces, as well as on the College website.

The institution has implemented structures and processes to assess how well it is meeting its mission, and has collaboratively reviewed, analyzed and used data to examine outcomes relevant to its mission statement. The most recent review of the WHCL mission statement occurred in September, 2016, during a campus-wide strategic planning session. Revisions were made and the current mission statement was approved by the WHCCD governing board in October, 2016. (Standard I.A.1; ER 6)

Finding and Evidence:
The College has addressed Standard IA and provided evidence to support its review, analysis and use of collaboration and data to review the mission statement. The mission statement describes the institution's broad educational purposes which include degrees, certificates and transfer, as well as associate degrees for transfer (ADTs). WHCL's intended student population is described as students seeking affordable, accessible, relevant and rigorous education.

The institution has implemented structures and processes to assess how well it is meeting its mission statement. The institutional leaders and stakeholders, including board members, community members, staff, and faculty are regularly engaged in reviewing and validating the institutional mission statement during the Eagle Vision Planning meetings. The College determines efficacy of its mission statement through data analysis in a variety of activities and venues such as the Equity Plan and Eagle Vision Planning. The team confirmed that the institution uses assessment results to set institutional priorities and improve practices and processes towards meeting its mission statement. The College is focused on student success and completion of educational goals as evidenced by the WHCL Strategic Plan Key Performance Indicators (KPI). These indicators measure important benchmarks such as time to completion. Furthermore, discussions of data, mission, and goals take place at regular meetings of the Student Success Team, which includes student service and instructional representatives. The institution uses data to evaluate how well it is accomplishing its mission, institutional priorities and educational needs of WHCL students. Data are made available through self-service reports

and posted materials, program review, institutional meetings. (Standard I.A.2)

The institution's instructional programs are aligned with its mission statement through a variety of processes and cyclical improvement cycles such as the program review process, the Achieve the Dream (ATD) planning and data analysis, review of specific data through Summer Institutes, and the Student Success Team annual meetings. The institution has implemented processes to assess its mission statement through Planning and Governance Council (PGC), through the Eagle Vision Planning sessions and at the program level through the program review process. The mission statement guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation. WHCL evaluates progress towards its mission statement through strategic goals and objectives using student achievement data and outcomes, institution-set standards and college/district-set standards designed as "stretch goals." (Standard I.A.3)

The mission statement clearly indicates measurable factors associated with quality education and commitment to student learning and student achievement. The mission statement is periodically reviewed, published widely and updated as necessary. Most recently the mission statement was reviewed at the college-wide planning meeting, approved by the Academic Senate in September, 2016, and adopted by the Board of Trustees in October, 2016. The mission statement is appropriate to a degree granting institution of higher education and the student population it serves. (Standards I.A.1, I.A.4; ER 6)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standards and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
College Recommendation #1 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College continue to strengthen institutional capacity to analyze data for: continuous improvement; resource allocation and planning; and to effectively address the goals and achieve the anticipated outcomes defined in the Quality Focus Essay. (Standards I.A.2, I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, III.D.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.6, IV.B.3, IV.D.6)

Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:
In general, the College is aware of and demonstrates a commitment to continuous quality improvement. The team found evidence that regular, sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about student learning outcomes (SLOs), student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement occurs throughout the College. The College president has provided strong leadership to encourage the use of data, outcomes, and assessment for continuous improvement, resource allocation, and strategic planning; however, the College is behind in the implementation of an integrated data-driven planning process, as defined in the Quality Focus Essay. Across the campus, there are multiple venues where these discussions take place, such a college-wide planning sessions, the Institutional Effectiveness and Program Review Committee, and Student Learning Outcomes workshops targeted to faculty and staff who are responsible for developing, assessing learning outcomes, and for completing program reviews. The team validated that there is broad engagement of college constituents in efforts to improve institutional effectiveness and student achievement; however, the College is lacking a coherent integrated model that clearly connects the use of data, outcomes, and assessment to planning and resource allocation to effect improvements. (Standards I.B.I.; I.B.2.; I.B.4; I.B.5; I.B.8; ER 11)

Findings and Evidence:
College processes require that all courses have SLOs that are vetted and approved through the Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLOC), and SLOs are required to be on the course syllabi. The institution conducts systematic and regular review of its programs, and evidence shows there is regular, sustained, and collegial dialog about outcomes. At the beginning of each odd numbered academic year, faculty are required to assess and analyze SLO data for all courses taught during fall and spring semesters. In fall 2016, under the present college leadership, the SLOC developed Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and have integrated them into the eLumen SLO database. The SLOC provides ongoing support and coaching sessions for SLO development and assessment through "SLONOPRONO" workshops. The team verified that the College has defined student learning outcomes (SLOs) for courses (CLOs), for programs (PLOs) and, very recently, for the institution as a whole (ILOs). The College is transitioning SLO-focused administrative and learning support services outcomes in operational areas to area unit outcomes. Additionally, through observations and interviews, it was determined that the College collects SLO data and is transitioning to eLumen to support unitary level data collection. The College has not fully transitioned at the time of the visit; therefore, there was limited data to review. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2., ER 11)

The College has established institutional set standards and plans to review them on a regular basis through Eagle Vision Planning sessions. This annual planning session focuses on reviewing institutional standards, goals, objectives, and mission for continuous improvement. Information regarding institutional set standards is published on the College website. (Standard I.B.3.)

The College has the ability to access data from the District data warehouse as well as external data reports to support data-informed decision-making. The College has an established College-

wide process for reviewing institutional level data. Additionally, the College has a codified process that requires a programmatic-level review of student learning data, programmatic performance (i.e. enrollment, efficiency, FTES, FTEF), and student achievement (i.e. success, retention, degrees, certificates, licensure exams) in support of program planning. Further, the College utilizes Program Reviews to examine the use of SLOs with emphasis to improve student learning. The Program Review process requires faculty, staff, and administration to examine and develop program mission statements that align with the College mission. The District provides the College standard program-level datasets, which includes instructional delivery modality, success, and retention. The College harvests data from standard data reports that are housed in the District portal site to support decisions at the College. The College anticipates having disaggregated data once eLumen is fully implemented. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, ER 11)

The College has a district established board policy and administrative procedure that outlines the review and approval process for all institutional policies and procedures. It assures submission, review, and timeline of policies for instructional programs, student support services, resource management, and governance. The College conducts a biannual assessment of governance and planning through a survey of committee members as means to measure communication and governance effectiveness. At the district level, policies for review are determined each year. However, the team could not verify that the District has a long-term plan for the systematic review and revision of all Board policies. (Standards I.B.7, IV.C.7)

Interviews with leaders, faculty, staff, and committees found that "SLONOPRONO" workshops and support coaches were the venues to train employees and build understanding around student academic performance metrics and outcomes. While information is disseminated and shared, the College recognizes that communication as a responsibility of all employees is inconsistent. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.8)

The team verified that College is engaged in continuous, systematic and broad-based evaluation and planning. The College's Planning and Governance Committee (PGC) is responsible for revising and making governance policy recommendations, communicating with respective stakeholders, college planning, and ongoing evaluation of college programs, plans, and initiatives to ensure alignment with the mission. There is a College Planning and Governance Manual that outlines the committee structure and processes to ensure engagement of multiple campus constituencies and the correlation of plans to the college mission and student achievement. As an example, the directive of the Institutional Effectiveness and Program Review Committee (IEPRC) is "To provide positive and engaged guidance and oversight to the program review process ensuring that all program reviews are up-to-date, complete, and aligned with key college and district planning documents."

Resource needs identified through program review, including personnel, technology, facilities, equipment, and supplies are made to the Budget Allocation Committee which in turn makes recommendations to the PGC. The Team observed a meeting where the PGC was developing improved methodology for assessing resources for prioritization. For longer range planning and to strengthen the links between the various plans at the College and district levels, the College has recognized the need for "establishing institutional data-driven planning that purposefully integrates planning, assessment and budget processes" and commits to address this issue through

its Quality Focus Essay (Standard I.B.9)

Conclusion:
Under the current leadership, West Hill College Lemoore shows a strong commitment to assuring academic quality and institutional effectiveness in support of its mission, and there is broad engagement of college constituents in these efforts. However, the College is lacking a coherent integrated model that systematically connects the use of data, outcomes and assessment to planning and resource allocation in order to effect improvements. The College is addressing this problem through the QFE and related action plans.

The College meets all parts of the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements except for subsections I.B.4. and I.B.5.

Recommendation:

College Recommendation #2 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the college develop and implement a coherent integrated model that clearly connects the use of data, outcomes, and assessment to planning and resource allocation to effect improvements. (Standards I.B.I, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.8, ER 11)

College Recommendation #3 (Compliance)
In order to meet the Standard, the Team recommends that all program outcomes be assessed and become part of the SLO cycle, and the SLO Committee facilitate the work of mapping, assessing, analyzing and using for improvement the Institutional Learning Outcomes. Additionally, the results of Program Level Outcomes and Institutional Level Outcomes should be integrated into institutional planning and resource allocation. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, II.A.3)

Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity

General Observations:
West Hills College Lemoore makes available to students, faculty, staff and the public at large clear, accurate, and updated information in printed and electronic formats. Information on accreditation, mission, educational programs, support services, and learning outcomes are included in the catalog and on various college webpages. Evidence shows that the College demonstrates integrity in multiple ways, including maintaining compliance with regulations, statutes, and guidelines, and maintaining appropriate relationships with Federal, State, and other agencies.

The WHCCD Board has established policies on academic freedom, ethics, and freedom of speech to assure institutional integrity. Policies on standards of student conduct and prohibited practices, such as discrimination and harassment, are also in place. Board policies also address academic honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity. The College upholds expectations of staff, faculty, administrators, and students to follow board policies and administrative regulations but does not require conformity to specific beliefs or world views.

The team verified that the College is compliant with all ACCJC Eligibility Requirements (ERs) which includes the posting of annual reports, information related to external evaluation team visits, and substantive change reporting.

Findings and Evidence:
The College Catalog is available in print and online and provides descriptive information on requirements, policies, and procedures. The College website and portal publicize the College mission statement, information on accreditation, academic programs, course schedules, student services, and learning outcomes, as well as the Clery Act crime statistics, data on gainful employment, graduation rates and student achievement. Additionally, the College provides a range of promotional materials about the college mission, admissions procedures, program and course offerings, support services, and campus news. (Standards I.C.1, I.C.2, I.C.3, I.C.4, ER 19, ER 20)

The College Catalog includes required general information, such as the official name, address, telephone numbers, website address, and mission statement, accreditation status, courses, programs, degrees offered, student learning outcomes for programs and degrees, academic calendar, academic freedom statement, financial aid, learning resources, names and degrees of administration, and names of governing board members. In addition, the catalog lists the requirements for admissions, student fees, and degrees, certificates, graduation, and transfer. Major policies affecting students are published regarding academic regulations, nondiscrimination, acceptance of transfer credits, transcripts, grievance and complaint procedures, sexual harassment, and refund of fees. (Standards I.C.1, I.C.2, ER 20)

The institution communicates matters of academic quality and publishes information about student achievement via the website and in print. The Student Success Scorecard, Institutional Data (Fact Book), and information on other performance indicators are available on the Office of

Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning website. The College is actively engaged in the assessment of learning and student achievement and widely publishes expected learning outcomes. However, while most of the academic programs listed on the College Catalog website have included the program and course-level student learning outcomes (SLOs), some failed to add the program SLOs on the college website and in the College Catalog. The SLO data are housed in the college portal, which may limit access to reviewing the findings. Similarly, the course and program SLO assessment results that are utilized in program review planning are housed within the college portal. Various student services departments reported that data collected in the past did not work well to measure service area SLOs. The College is currently working on identifying data it should collect to support intended metrics and consequently use to clearly explain outcomes and student achievement. Some programs do not have a systematic process in place to gather data to measure SLOs and recognize the need to identify appropriate data required to measure achievement of desired learning outcomes. Interviews with instructional faculty and various committees found that SLOs are being measured on a consistent basis through the utilization of rubrics and by integrating the findings into area discussion and program review. (Standards I.C.1., I.C.2., I.C.3., ER 20)

The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements and, in most cases, expected learning outcomes. Some disciplines have a website which includes a program learning outcomes and major courses required; however, not all departments have a comprehensive website. Major requirements are listed for Certificates, Associates Degree, and transfer to CSU, and UC. While all academic and career technical education programs are listed in the 2016-2017 College Catalog, not all programs list the program learning outcomes. Additionally, inconsistency exists on programmatic-level accreditation between the ISER, the 2016-2017 College Catalog, and College website. (I.C.3, I.C.4)

College entities meet on a regular basis to review policies, procedures and publications to assure integrity. The process engages representatives from a various College constituencies to ensure inclusion of all stakeholders. The appropriate entities, such as the Planning and Governance Council and the Curriculum Committee, review and make recommendations to ensure policies and procedures meet the mission and goals of the College. At the District level, batches of WHCCD Board policies are reviewed annually; however, there is not a systematic process for when specific policies are due for review, and the team found that many board policies and administrative procedures have not been reviewed for over five years. (Standard I.C.5, IV.C.7)

The College website and catalog provide information for current and prospective students regarding the cost of education per unit, fees, textbooks and course materials, as well as information about refund policies and financial aid options. Additionally, the website provides multiple resources for students seeking financial support and provides links to internal and external services. (Standard I.C.6)

The West Hills Community College District exhibits a strong commitment to Academic Freedom, which the related Board Policy 4030 describes thusly: "Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher to teach and of the student in the freedom to learn. Academic freedom carries with it duties correlative with rights".

The policy is referenced in the College Catalog and published on the website. This policy was established in 1998 reviewed/revised in 2012. (Standard I.C.7., ER 13)

The District also has policies and procedures setting expectations about ethical behavior, honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity that apply to all constituencies, for example BP 3050-Institutional Code of Ethics. Students are held accountable for BP 5505, Academic Dishonesty, and are expected to make a commitment at the time of admission to the college by singing the following statement on the application: "I will be academically honest in all of my academic work and will not take part in academic dishonesty of others." The policy delineates the College process for resolving allegations of academic dishonesty, consequences, and repeated violations. These and all other approved policies are posted on the College and District websites. (Standards I.C.8, I.C.9)

The College does not operate in any foreign locations. Also, it does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct for staff, faculty, administrators, or students or seek to instill specific beliefs or world views. (Standards I.C.10, I.C.11)

The team affirms that the College does maintain integrity in its relations with ACCJC. The College accreditation status and accompanying documents are posted on the College website, including all correspondence to and from ACCJC. The team found that the accreditation status is also in the catalog on page 7. Evidence shows that the College publishes notifications of evaluation team visits, follow-up reports, and provides opportunities for third-party comments. Also available on the website, under the accreditation tab, is a statement on filing complaints with a link to the ACCJC complaint process. Programmatic accreditation from other entities are not collectively listed on the Accreditation webpage, and are rather difficult to find on the individual program webpages. However, the ISER names three programs with industry-specific accreditations: Administration of Justice, Registered Nursing, and the Paramedic program. (Standards I.C.12, I.C.1, ER 21)

The College ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement, and student learning is central to all services and activities. It is not beholden to investors or a parent organization. The District engages in fundraising through the West Hills Community College Foundation to support student learning and achievement through scholarships and grants. The Foundation operates as a 501(c)(3). (Standard I.C.14.)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendation:
College Recommendation #4 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness, the Team recommends that the College publish Program Learning Outcomes for all programs, ensure all syllabi identify established Course Learning Outcomes, and establish regular and planned evaluation of processes for continuous improvement. (Standards I.C.1, I.C.2, II.A.3, ER 20)

Standard II
Student Learning Programs and Support Services

Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

General Observations:
The instructional programs offered by West Hills College Lemoore primarily focus on general education, transfer, pre-college, and career technical courses, degrees and certificates. Courses are provided in a variety of delivery modes including face-to-face, online, hybrid, and web-enhanced. The College engages in a systematic review process of its programs and services to assure currency, improve teaching and learning, and to support student success. College leaders acknowledge the institution has faced some challenges in composing and assessing course level outcomes (CLOs) for courses that are not typically taught by full-time faculty. The College has responded by assigning faculty mentors or sponsors to assist adjunct faculty to navigate the process. The college also provides support to all faculty through a workshop series to provide technical assistance in completing CLO requirements.

Consistently, the team heard the staff and faculty describe the campus culture as being one that resembles a "family" which allows them to work collaboratively in serving students.

Findings and Evidence:
The instructional programs offered by WHCL, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education, are consistent with the college's mission and appropriate for students to earn certificates, degrees, transfer, and employment. The College does not offer correspondence courses. The institution has recently engaged in a collaborative process to revise its mission statement, which undergoes review each year. The College awards course credit, certificates, and degrees based on student attainment of identified learning outcomes and is examining a new process for a more granular assessment of certificate completion. WHCL has developed course and program level outcomes and assessment cycles but has not completed assessment cycles for all courses and programs. The College follows common practices for curriculum approval and program review. The team found evidence of developed policies and procedures for regular program review, which are applied equally to distance education (DE) classes. (Standard II.A.1, ER 9, ER 11)

College faculty ensures the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty are responsible for continuously reviewing their instructional courses, programs, and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success. The College provides venues for discussion related to instruction, such as Learning Area meetings, curriculum committee, outcomes assessment dialogues, and advisory groups. The College has developed a process for tracking completion of outcomes assessment cycles; however, in viewing the tracking data, the process has not been entirely successful. (Standard II.A.2)

The team found examples of outcome assessments that led to resource allocation and change. The College is moving from an institutionally developed tracking system for SLOs to eLumen software for recording, mapping, and analysis of SLOs. Up until this time, program student learning outcomes assessment has been done through a published template, the Program Review process, and the five Learning Areas when faculty gather to review and discuss their aggregated outcomes work. While implementing eLumen, the College is reassessing its approach to Program Outcomes. At this time, some disciplines do not complete program review (such as English, History, or Philosophy) course assessment and analysis results are not represented forward from the course level to resource allocation. These discipline areas do not have an identified degree, and are not represented formally. The eLumen conversion is providing an opportunity for the College to reconsider their previous process of assessment, dialog and change. Therefore, course outcomes are part of program and/or institutional student learning outcomes. The College leadership acknowledge that they are behind in the development and implementation of Institutional Learning Outcomes and, upon her arrival last year, the College President expedited this process. Consequently, the faculty are not yet assessing Institutional Learning Outcomes. While ILOs are now developed, the team could not find evidence they are published in the Catalog and had difficulty locating them online. The ILOs are published on the Mission and Vision webpage. Eighty percent of the syllabi sampled clearly identified SLOs, and instructors provide syllabi to students either in paper or electronic format at the beginning of the course. (Standard II.A.3)

The College offers pre-collegiate credit and non-credit courses in support of English, math, and ESL. To expedite the process of getting students into college level courses, non-credit courses are offered to prepare students below the cut score level to reassess and provide focused learning support for basic skills students through their Academic Center for Excellence (ACE). Since 2012, WHCL English and math faculty have met regularly with service area high school faculty on a regional "Closing the Gap" project. This collaborative project involves professional development for faculty, curriculum alignment concerning college and high school courses, and high school course design to prepare seniors for college level English and math. The College is exploring a multiple measure approach for English and math, which they hope to implement fall 2017. (Standard II.A.4)

The College offers 15 associate degrees for transfer as approved by the state Chancellor's Office. A rigorous and regular review of curriculum is built into the processes of the College guided by a comprehensive Curriculum Handbook. The curriculum process guarantees the appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning through the "Rule of 7" review for all curriculum. The College defines and incorporates general education coursework into all of its degrees. The general education pattern is designed to mirror the general education categories for transfer institutions. The College has approved general education curriculum by reviewing breadth, exposure to new material and depth of curriculum content. It is consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. Validation of the rigor, degree credit, and content is certified by submission for transfer college approval on ASSIST. Review of ASSIST confirms that WHLC has courses certified in all areas and courses appear to be up-to-date. General education courses are selected to ensure students achieve comprehensive learning outcomes in the degree program. The team was able to verify

that 100% of the general education courses have been assessed for CSLOs. (Standard II.A.5, ER 12)

The College schedules courses at a variety of times, locations, and modalities that allow students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period consistent with established expectations in higher education, two years in the case of associate degree programs and less for certificate programs. Faculty and administrators review scheduling and have implemented REG 365 which encourages one time registration in the spring semester for the entire upcoming academic year. The College has developed an accelerated Business AA-T that has been articulated with the local transfer institutions. This has not only decreased time to completion but also increased the number of degrees awarded. The College is organized in learning areas, that resemble pathways, and this aligns with Student Success teams integrating education and student services support for students within those majors. (Standard II.A.6 ER 9)

WHCL has several support services to work with its diverse students. Faculty are trained on the American with Disabilities Act, use of assistive technology, and other accommodations information to make certain all courses are accessible to all students, regardless of abilities. Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) staff offer training to faculty to support development of accommodations for students with disabilities. The College analyzes program review data relative to student success and compares success rates across the several types of course modalities offered to determine if a particular modality serves students' needs. The High Tech Center and the Educational Technology specialist work directly with faculty to make certain all courses, including those mediated through technology, are accessible to all students. The institution describes several faculty development opportunities provided to faculty designed to support instructional improvement and course redesign. (Standard II.A.7)

The College provides access to unbiased and reliable direct assessment of prior learning and is working to strengthen the use of prior learning assessments. Although WHCL does not have discipline-wide examinations in place, the team found examples of common assessments through test banks within the Learning Management System tied to student learning outcomes (SLOs) and writing assignments in English and history that include rubrics to consistently assess SLOs. Faculty, staff, and administration have attended multiple workshops and conferences to explore and gather information to strengthen prior learning assessments. The District conducts periodic analysis for math and English placement test and cut-score validations for the College to reduce test bias using measures, statistical analysis, and input from faculty. Future assessment work for WHCL includes participating in the California Community College Common Assessment Project, reviewing multiple measures in English/math to place high school students, and using Cal PASS Plus data to eliminate local test validation. (Standard II.A.8)

The team confirmed that WHCL awards credits based on generally accepted practices for degree-granting institutions of higher education, and provides appropriate information about the awarding of academic credit. Approval at the CCCCO guarantees compliance with statutory and system regulatory requirements. The College does not offer courses based upon clock hours. (Standard II.A.9)

The College catalog provides clear information on acceptance transfer-of-credit policies, and the transfer requirements to four-year universities. College level articulation is processed by the articulation officer located at the District Office whose role is to work with instructional programs to seek new and regularly update existing articulation agreements. The articulation officer updates information on Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) to reflect articulation agreements with four-year universities within the California State University and University of California systems. AP 4107 (Transfer Program) outlines transfer degree requirements, IGETC, minimum English and math transfer requirements, and transfer level course numbering description. (Standard II.A.10)

WHCL has yet to develop an assessment process for Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). The College is confident that the implementation of a software data solution will enable them to develop all the aspects of their outcomes assessment processes. A great deal of work and improvement has occurred in SLO assessment and general education, however, there are still gaps with regards to the breadth of outcomes and in closing the loop in GE outcomes. (Standard II.A.11)

The College's general educational requirements as shown in the catalog are broad-based and comprehensive in each area A-E, and the General Education Policy is clearly stated in the catalog. As courses are considered for inclusion in the general education curriculum, they are vetted through a process that leads to a determination of their appropriateness. WHCL tracks the assessment of course and program level outcomes on a rotating 2 year schedule. (Standard II.A.12, ER 12)

WHCL degree programs include both general education courses and focused study in one area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core. Each program has Program Learning Outcomes that are mapped from the courses in that program; these Course Learning Outcomes are assessed based on concepts and competencies that include mastery at the appropriate degree level of key theories and practices within the field of study. (Standard II.A.13)

The College's graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification. A general Career Technical Education (CTE) Advisory Committee meets at a minimum twice a year and includes divergent industry leaders and potential employers who provide feedback on technical and professional competencies and standards. (Standard II.A.14)

The team confirmed the District has a Board Policy and an Administrative Procedure for Program Discontinuance. Although the College has not employed this procedure, the Learning Area counselor will assist any student in a program where there is significant change in requirements or there is a program discontinuance outside of the formal process. Course substitutions are made available to students in appropriate situations. (Standard II.A.15)

WHCL regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of instructional programs, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location**.** The College has committees

charged with specific coursework, such as Basic Skills and CTE. Programs are reviewed through a rigorous four-year cycle with a two-year mid-term program review. CTE courses are reviewed every two years. A program viability plan was developed to maintain current programs and determine when programs should be discontinued. The College has developed unique programs that meet the needs of the local area such as the Teacher Education program. The team determined that, overall, the Planning and Governance Council systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students. (Standard II.A.16)

Conclusion:
The College does not meet the Standard but does meet the related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
See College Recommendation #3 (Improvement)

See College Recommendation #4 (Compliance)

College Recommendation #5 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends the college strengthen the analysis and planning around student achievement between face-to-face and online course sections and use the data to develop and implement strategies to improve student achievement. (Standard II.A.16)

Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:
The West Hills College Lemoore (WHCL) library provides sufficient library and learning support services to complement its mission. The library's collection consists of approximately 30,000 print books, over 70 print periodical subscriptions, more than 17,000 e-books, and nearly 40 online databases. Computers with both the Microsoft and Adobe software suites, as well as partially subsidized printing services, are available to students within the library. The library provides orientation and information competency sessions for students - approximately 10 each semester - and typically requested by classroom faculty. The College library staffing is comprised of one full-time librarian, two adjunct librarians, three classified staff, and several student workers. The team confirmed that the library is well-represented on campus governance committees.

Tutoring services are provided through a peer tutoring operation as well as the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) South, both housed in the library building. ACE provides assistance in English, math, sciences, and ESL, among other subjects. In summer 2017, an additional tutoring operation, ACE-North, which provides support at the basic skills level, may be moving into the library. Tutoring for online distance education students is available through NetTutor, with a link to the service embedded within Canvas.

Findings and Evidence:
WHCL's library provides support services that complements the college mission. The College library supports the learning and teaching needs of all students through the hiring of librarians and support professionals, educational equipment and materials. The team found evidence that the library actively identifies necessary outcomes and assesses them, reflecting upon the results and implementing changes as needed. The library reflects on student needs and changes in its program plan, which is submitted every four years with a mid-term report at the end of two years. Additionally, the team found that library engages in robust dialog across the campus, with library staff included in several shared governance committees. The library maintains frequent contact with instructional faculty to identify needs that can support student learning, and the curriculum development process incorporates a review of available and needed library materials to support new courses under consideration. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2, II.B.3, ER 17)

At WHCL, library databases are purchased at group rates through the California College Library Consortium. The College maintains membership with the Council of Chief Librarians. These research databases are evaluated by usage statistics provided by consortium. Inter-library loan agreements are in place between the Lemoore and Coalinga campuses and with the nearby California State University Fresno library. Contractual agreements with Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) and EZProxy (a single sign on service) ensure access to library materials are password protected and accessible to students and staff. (Standard II.B.4, ER 17)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations: None

Standard II.C: Student Support Services

General Observations:
West Hills College Lemoore (WHCL) has created a comprehensive program of student support services that demonstrates its commitment to a level of quality that enhances student learning and achievement, regardless of location or means of delivery. The College provides appropriate student services programs consistent with its student demographics and its mission. The Student Services division works collaboratively with other campus areas, including Instruction, to ensure that students are appropriately prepared to begin classes and to provide expansive support while enrolled. Student support services staff have embarked upon innovative initiatives and services, in part prompted by the Student Success Act, to meet the needs of students. The College takes pride in its co-curricular and athletic programs, with a flourishing Associated Student Body (ASB) leadership program and eight intercollegiate sport programs. ASB leaders take pride in the College and represent the student voice on key participatory governance committees. The new Golden Eagle Student Union provides a venue for students to gather and engage with one another.

The College adheres to admission policies that are consistent with the mission of the College and specifies the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. These policies are published in the catalog and class schedule, and are available on College and District websites. Additionally, academic programs that have special admission/selection processes, such as nursing, include this information in program applications and on the website. The College assures equitable access to its diverse students consistent with its mission. The outreach team has been instrumental in developing meaningful high school partnerships with Eagle Dayz, serving over 600 prospective students each spring. The College exhibits a commitment to quality student support services across campus through the alignment of human capital and technology conduits such as the implementation of myWestHills portal. The Portal provides a safe and secure way for students to conduct a wide range of business with student services staff. Each service area conducts regular staff meetings and engages in training and other staff development activities. Mega-Meetings, which occur all-day twice per semester, allow all student support services staff, faculty, and administrators to engage with one another to review student data and advance the College's student success agenda.

The College assures the quality of its student support services through its program review and assessment practices with program areas conducting comprehensive program review every four years, with a mid-term report every two years. Both quantitative and qualitative data are used to measure its efficacy. While this process is currently employed by certain programs, the College would benefit from expanding program review and outcomes assessment to other student support services to facilitate continuous improvement.

The District and colleges have high standards for the confidentiality, maintenance, release, and destruction of student records. District policies and practices have been developed in accordance with state and federal law and are strictly adhered to. There are a number of safeguards in place to protect the confidentiality of student records, including the following: requiring pre-approved access to records, preserving records in a password encrypted electronic imaging system,

backing up electronic records every two hours, and restricting access through the use of controlled passwords.

Findings and Evidence:

WHCL has created a comprehensive program of student support services that demonstrates its commitment to a level of quality that enhances student learning and achievement, regardless of location or means of delivery. The College assures the quality of its student support services through its program review and assessment practices with program areas conducting comprehensive program review every four years, with a mid-term report every two years. Both quantitative and qualitative data are used to measure its efficacy. While this process is currently employed by certain programs, the College would benefit from expanding program review and outcomes assessment to other student support services to facilitate continuous improvement. The College offers an array of student support services, both onsite and online. The team confirmed that the College provides appropriate student services programs consistent with its student demographics and its mission. The team also verified that the College assures the quality of its student support services through its program review and assessment practices with program areas conducting comprehensive program review every four years, with a mid-term report every two years. Both quantitative and qualitative data are used to measure their efficacy. (Standard II.C.1, II.C.2, ER 15)

WHCL has created a comprehensive program of student support services that demonstrates its commitment to a level of quality that enhances student learning and achievement, regardless of location or means of delivery. Students are able to access services on campus beginning at 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and online through myWestHills portal 24 hours a day seven days a week. During peak times of the semester, student services extends hours to meet the needs of students. All buildings at West Hills College Lemoore are ADA compliant and the College works to ensure all online resources are Section 508 compliant. (Standard II.C.3, ER 15)

The College supports co-curricular programs through the Athletics Department and through the Associated Student Body (ASB). The College offers eight sports for male and female students. The Athletic Program complies with CCCAA articles and bylaws, and in accordance, requires all student athletes have student education plans, appropriate credit hours and minimum GPA in order to participate in athletics. Evidence shows that WHCL student athletes excel academically and, in 2015, the College athletic program had six students recognized for achieving exceptional results in the classroom. (Standard II.C.4)

The College provides comprehensive counseling/advising services through the Counseling Department, grant-funded initiatives, and categorical programs and services such as CalWORKS, EOPS, CARE, DSPS, Transfer, and Veterans. Counseling services are provided to students through a variety of means to include, traditional in-person counseling, phone appointments, via the student portal and via email. Counseling faculty establish standards and adopt best practices to guarantee students are receiving consistent, useful, and timely information regarding academic requirements. Student Services Personnel Trainings are offered to ensure students are receiving accurate, timely, and useful information to meet institution-set standards for student achievement and success. (Standard II.C.5)

The College adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission and is open to anyone possessing a high school diploma or who is 18 years of age or older if that individual is able to benefit from the programs and services offered at the College. The College follows District Board Policy 5010 regarding its admission practices, and is an open access institution. WHCL instructional faculty, counselors, and advisors collaborate to develop clear educational pathways leading to certificates and degrees. (Standard II.C.6, ER 16)

Evidence confirms that Admission and Records instruments, practices, processes, and procedures are routinely discussed and reviewed at both the college and district level to make certain they are effective, consistent, and unbiased. The College uses CCCApply as its primary application process. This online process is available in Spanish and is accessible through the college website, and was designed with collaboration from other college users and in consultation with the state Chancellor's Office. The process allows the College to collect and respond to data about individual student needs. Once a student is admitted, the College suggests course pathways for specific majors. Disproportionate impact studies are conducted on a regular cycle, and English and math faculty work with counseling personnel to review placement test cut scores on a regular basis. Additionally, WHCL is evaluating multiple measures to ensure that students are appropriately placed in courses for their skill level. WHCL will begin implementation of the California Community College Chancellor's Office common assessment in 2018. (Standard II.C.7)

District policies outline the maintenance and security of student records as mandated by federal regulations, California Education Code and the California Code of regulations, Title 5. The team confirmed that the district maintains procedures ensuring that access to student records is restricted only to those individuals permitted such access by law and who require such access to carry on the operation of the district. Electronic records are saved and backed up by WHCCD Information Technology Services (ITS) every two hours. Student records are also preserved in an electronic imaging system, On Base, which is password encrypted with a pre-approved access requirement. The College publishes policies regarding the release of student records in the College catalog and website. (Standard II.C.8)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
None

Standard III
Resources

Standard III.A: Human Resources

General Observations:
West Hills College Lemoore (WHCL) is one of two colleges within the West Hills Community College District (WHCCD). Human Resources functions are centralized at the District level. As such, much interaction occurs between the College and the District Office.

The District has two primary bargaining units, the California Faculty Association and the California School Employees Association for classified staff. Adjunct faculty are not included in the faculty collective bargaining unit. WHCL employs roughly 43 full-time and 112 part-time faculty, 66 full-time and part-time classified staff, and 13 administrators.

The College provided board policies and administrative procedures, performance evaluation tools, employment contracts, equivalency documents, and other human resources evidence for review. WHCL adheres to the Board's policies and procedures on staff recruitment, ethical conduct, prohibiting harassment, respecting diversity and equity, and other human resource requirements. These policies and procedures are posted on the District website and are easy to access.

Findings and Evidence:
The College hires faculty, staff, and administrators using established criteria and procedures. Hiring procedures are established through board policy and are in alignment with state education code. During the hiring process, WHCCD considers an individuals' understanding of, sensitivity to, and respect for the service area and diverse student population. Faculty subject matter experts are primarily responsible to ensure that faculty hiring include an emphasis on effective teaching. Moreover, prior to an offer of employment, District Human Resources verifies all potential hires possess the necessary qualifications (education, experience, etc.) to perform the duties required to maintain and enhance institutional effectiveness and academic quality. (Standards III.A.1, III.A.2, III.A.3, ER 14)

Nearly all job descriptions directly relate to the College's mission, accurately reflect duties and responsibilities, and require faculty to maintain curriculum, analyze and assess student learning outcomes. However, job descriptions and postings for adjunct faculty are quite brief and do not include or mention curriculum maintenance or student learning outcomes, although the College confirms that adjunct faculty are performing these functions, where appropriate. In addition, the College has written criteria to evaluate its faculty, staff, and administrators. For some, (but not all) personnel, these evaluation criteria include components designed to assess learning outcomes in an effort to improve the learning environment. While the job descriptions of academic administrative staff covers learning outcomes, the learning outcomes are not included within the evaluation tool for this class of employees. (Standards III.A.2, ER 14, III.A.6)

The evaluation tracking process for full-time faculty and permanent employees largely resides

with District Human Resources, which operates within the guidelines of collective bargaining and district board policy. Evaluations for part-time faculty are administered and tracked at the college level; these evaluations are at stated intervals of once in their first semester and at least once every two years thereafter. Classified staff evaluations occur in each of the first four years, then once every three years, as identified in policy and in the collective bargaining agreement. Finally, Board policies are in place to guide the self-evaluation of the board of trustees as well as district senior administrators. Appropriate follow-up on evaluations was documented and timely. (Standard III.A.5)

All faculty, administrators and other employees are required to meet minimum educational and experience qualifications as outlined by the California Education Code, California Academic Senate, and West Hills Community College District. Pursuant to these requirements, the College, in conjunction with District Human Resources, hires sufficient faculty, administrators, and other employees that meet or exceed established minimum qualifications, including a process to determine equivalency for degrees from non-US institutions. Overall staffing levels at the College are sufficient to achieve the educational programs, the mission, and adequately run operations; however, an expertise gap exists at the College due to no local business office staff or personnel sufficiently knowledgeable in financial resources. This expertise gap hampers the efficient administrative operations of the College. (Standards III.A.4, III.A.7, III.A.9, III.A.10, ER 8)

In an effort to maintain a high level of competency in assigned areas of responsibility and to sustain college effectiveness, the College encourages its full-time academic employees to attend professional meetings and conferences. Faculty have attended and participated in professional development opportunities such as; Closing the Gap, Essential Elements, open education resources, and Achieving the Dream conferences and workshops. Part-time faculty are also encouraged to participate and are provided opportunities to attend professional development activities. (Standard III.A.8)

Policies and procedures are easily accessible through the District website and are consistently and equitably administered. Further, Board Policy 7100 "Commitment to Diversity" shows the commitment of the District to support its diverse personnel. A key performance indicator of the College, approved by the Governing Board, is to compare the gender and ethnicity of employees to the community and student population the campus serves to ensure that progress is being made to close the gap. (Standards III.A.11, III.A.12)

Board Policy 3050 provides a written code of professional ethics for employees and additional policies spell out potential consequences for not adhering to these stated ethics. In addition, the District Office houses personnel records for all employees; these records reside in a lockable room supervised by a human resources staff member. (Standards III.A.13, III.A.15)

Significant professional development opportunities are available to employees, and this is clearly a priority of the Governing Board. The Team would like to commend the College and District for significantly investing in its workforce's professional growth. Specifically, the Team would like to highlight the College and District's commitment to investing in the continuing education of its employees through a tuition reimbursement program that can offset the costs of continuing

education by as much as $3,000 annually per participant. (Standard III.A.14)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:

District Recommendation #1 (Improvement) In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the district update the evaluation instrument of academic administrators to formally include the use of results of learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. (Standard III.A.6)

College Recommendation #6 (Improvement)
In order to improve effectiveness and to more clearly delineate college level budget autonomy, the Team recommends that the College should have sufficient personnel knowledgeable in financial resources to: effectively interface with District Business Services on behalf of the College; enhance transparency related to budget and purchasing transactions and decisions; articulate complex financial information to College staff; assist with local budgetary issues; perform intricate analysis to aid in the overall financial management of the College. (Standards III.A.9, III.D.2, III.D.5)

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

General Observations:
The College is situated on over 100 acres, which provides the capacity to build-out to 10,000 students. The College has passed several bond measures, allowing for significant investment in physical resources. For example, in November 2008, the College successfully passed a $31 million general obligation bond, providing matching funds for Phase 3 of campus construction. Facilities added in this phase include the Golden Eagle Arena, opened in 2011, and a campus Student Union, opened in spring 2017, housing the bookstore, food court, offices for the Associated Student Body and a student lounge as a general gathering space.

Recently, a new committee called the Facilities and Safety Committee (FSC) was created in order to prioritize and communicate the facilities needs of the College to the Planning and Governance Council. This new structure migrates from a structure where the former architectural firm was setting the priorities for the College to a participatory governance committee that empowers the College to set its own schedule and evaluate its own priorities. In interviews with College staff, this change was viewed as a favorable turn of events.

Findings and Evidence:
The College takes significant actions to ensure buildings are constructed and maintained in such a way as to maintain access, ensure safety, and provide security within its physical resources. These actions include a new formed Facilities and Safety Committee (FSC), chaired by the Director of Maintenance and Operations; this participatory governance committee is responsible for developing, monitoring, and reviewing plans related to safety, construction, and other facilities issues. Recommendations from this committee are forwarded to the Planning and Governance Council, the primary participatory governance committee of the College. All buildings are subject to inspections and safety evaluations; these evaluations are contracted through Keenan and Associates and any findings or deficiencies identified are brought to the necessary college and district personnel to be addressed. (Standard III.B.1)

The College is located on over 100 acres, donated to the West Hills District in 2000. The size of the campus provides significant opportunities for additional build-out, if necessary. Most recently, a $31 million bond measure allowed for the Golden Eagle Arena, completed in 2011, and a Student Union building, completed in 2017. Future facilities and grounds improvements for the College are outlined in the Scheduled Maintenance Plan of the College. An updated Facilities Master Plan has recently been contracted to a new architectural firm. (Standards III.B.2, III.B.4)

Prior to 2016, planning and evaluation of College facilities and equipment was done through the Facilities Subcommittee by reviewing reports from the former architectural firm. However, it was noted that recommendations from program reviews would not be consistently forwarded to the subcommittee for review. In speaking with College staff, the architectural firm largely drove the conversation and set the priorities. Starting in fall 2016, responsibility for this review process transitioned to the Budget Allocation Committee and the newly established Facilities and Safety Committee. While migrating to this new process and committee structure is to be commended,

the College should fully implement and evaluate the effectiveness of this structure after the new architectural firm integrates into the process. (Standard III.B.3)

The District produces a five-year construction plan in collaboration with the Facilities and Safety Committee of the College. This plan includes future construction with new buildings to be located at the south part of campus and an additional academic building near the library. Any new facilities will be subject to total cost of ownership projections, which the College has an established history of factoring into the planning. (Standard III.B.4)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
None

Standard III.C Technology Resources

General Observations:
The College receives technology support and services from two District departments: Information Technology (IT) and Connected Learning. IT provides planning and support for all College technology functions, services, and systems. Connected Learning is responsible for meeting the technology training needs of the college's staff and students. The District successfully passed Measure T in 2014, which has provided both colleges with a robust funding source for upgrading its technology infrastructure.

Findings and Evidence:
The College's technology needs are primarily identified through the program review process, or by serendipitous discovery. The technology needs are identified by the campus Technology Committee, which provides recommendations to the campus Planning and Governance Council (PGC). The PGC evaluates requests and provides feedback to the Technology Committee, which then submits its prioritized campus recommendations to one of the subcommittees of the District Technology Committee (DTC), the Instructional Technology Advisory Group or the Administrative Technology Advisory Group. The two District subcommittees are responsible for evaluating and prioritizing all District technology needs and submission to the Chancellor's Executive Cabinet for final assessment and budgeting. The DTC initiated a restructure in 2015-16 of the District technology committees' structure and flow, to better address prioritization and information flow. The District's technology needs are guided by the District Technology Strategic Plan and the Distance Education Plan, both of which are reviewed by numerous participatory governance groups at each of the District's two colleges. Interviews with staff and faculty indicate a widespread perception that the recent changes are extremely positive. Within the revised structure, the newly invigorated campus Technology Committee now serves as a forum for faculty, administration, and students to bring forward technology needs and opportunities. In addition, the District marketing department manages the content and design of the campus websites and SharePoint portal. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.2)

All students and staff have secure, assigned user accounts, used for nearly all District computers and systems. The District maintains regular backups on the Coalinga campus for the College servers, with data from dynamic systems being backed up every few hours. The District also maintains a duplicate disaster recovery Data Domain device on the Lemoore campus, with District data replicated regularly. Downtime statistics confirm the reliability of primary District technology environments. Occasional downtimes which still occur for the remote Mendota site are power-related and out of the control of the District. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3)

With the passage of a general obligation bond, Measure T, in 2014, the District established a reliable funding source for implementing several forward looking technology initiatives, including a mandatory hardware replacement cycle to ensure that hardware within the District continues to be usable and supportable. All District computers have a standardized set of software, and each also includes software for remote reporting of problems to technology staff. The District also pursues an aggressive updating policy for common software, both on individual desktops and on classroom computers. Communication between District IT and the college

instruction staff have improved, and the timing of classroom updating is now largely determined by faculty teaching in the classrooms. (Standard III.C.3)

Technical training and support for the college's staff and students is provided by the District Connected Learning department. Scheduled workshops and individual training sessions are provided for such tools as SharePoint, Canvas, Microsoft products, cloud storage, and security awareness. In addition, a College Faculty Development Lab, located in the library, is available for faculty to learn about current teaching and technology trends, instructional design, mobile device applications, and other current instructional technology topics. Students can receive either scheduled or ad-hoc technology training and support at the Academic Center for Excellence labs, the High Technology Access Center, and the Library. Numerous online training resources are also provided by the District's technology support departments. Training needs are assessed through input and feedback from student and staff satisfaction surveys and attendee evaluations. The District IT department maintains a reporting system for technology problems, and it has a service response target of two hours for at least a status report, if not a resolution to the reported problem. The Team was impressed with the District IT department and commends its commitment, dedication, and short response time as it so deftly handles the rigor of servicing an area of nearly 3,500 square miles. (Standard III.C.4)

The District has an official Computer and Network Use Board policy and procedure, as well as additional technology use policies within the Standards of Student Conduct and the Academic Honesty policy, all publicly available via the Board of Trustees web page on the District's website. Newly hired college staff are required to sign a Computer and Network Use Agreement, and instructors are encouraged to refer to the policy in their syllabi. (Standard III.C.5)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
None

Standard III.D: Fiscal Resources

General Observations:
The West Hills Community College District centralizes its business and financial functions, with all financial staff housed at the District Office. The president of the College functions as the financial liaison between the District and the college constituencies.

The College has a clearly defined participatory process to determine local financial resource allocation. Utilizing program review, Area Budget Committees act as the first conduit for financial resource requests. These requests are prioritized and subsequently forwarded to the college's Budget Allocation Committee. In turn, the Budget Allocation committee makes recommendations for funding to the college Planning and Governance Council (PGC). Prioritized recommendations made by the PGC are carried forward by the College President to the Chancellor's Executive Cabinet for final approval at the District level.

Audit and financial reports indicate the District is fiscally sound, with large fund balances and manageable liabilities. For the past six years, the independent external auditors have reported no findings and have given favorable opinions on the District's financial statements. Board policies mandate a reserve level of 5 percent, with the District easily attaining this goal.

Findings and Evidence:

Planning
The College receives an allocation from the West Hills Community College District (WHCCD) annually to sponsor student learning programs and services. Throughout the year, adjustments are made based upon known or anticipated changes. Once allocated, the College distributes resources for the purpose of prioritizing and planning human resources, support services, and academic programs. Through its internal planning processes and governance structure, the College plans and manages its financial affairs in such a way to ensure integrity and financial stability. (Standard III.D.1, ER 18)

Financial planning is aligned with the College's mission and goals; moreover, financial planning is integrated with and supports institutional planning. This is accomplished through the program review, strategic planning, and local resource allocation process and is facilitated with assistance from District Business Services in alignment with established policies and procedures. While spreadsheets with budget information are provided by District Business Services to assist during the planning process, the expertise to decipher and make full use of this information does not necessarily reside at the College. This hampers the college's ability to articulate complex financial information to College staff, provide assistance with local budgetary issues, and to perform intricate analysis to aid in the overall financial management of the College. (Standard III.D.2)

The guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development are clearly identified through established policies and procedures, a well-known participatory governance process at the College, and a timeline that is consistent with state-mandated deadlines. (Standard III.D.3)

Fiscal Responsibility and Stability

The College planning process is done in concert with financial information provided by District Business Services. This information informs the planning process and allows for a realistic picture of available resources. The committees assigned with prioritizing financial resource requests are made aware of the likely amount of funds available and conduct their business cognizant of that financial reality. (Standard III.D.4)

External audits provide a basis from which to measure the financial integrity and internal control structure; in that respect, the District has performed exceedingly well with no findings or internal control issues in the past six years. The audit information is available on the District website and is annually presented to the Governing Board. However, the dissemination of dependable and timely information from the District to the College has been an area of discontent. This discontent has bred confusion at the College as to how certain requests are funded, why changes are seemingly made by the District to College-decided financial priorities (having gone through participatory governance), as well as a general lack of understanding of how to review budget to actual expenditures. Both colleges in the District have included this issue as part of the Quality Focus Essay. (Standard III.D.5)

The financial documents, including the budget, are credible, accurate and are reflect allocations throughout the various District sites consistent with the District's resource allocation model. As stated, the District's external auditor annually assesses the internal controls and issues an opinion on the financial statements of the District. With no audit findings in the past six years, no follow-up has been necessary by District or College staff. Moreover, the financial and internal controls were reviewed by external consultants and program review of District Business Services occurred; this program review included a survey to the two colleges within the District. (Standards III.D.6, III.D.7, III.D.8)

The District maintains sufficient cash flow and has a Board-mandated reserve of a minimum of 5 percent. The most recent ending fund balance was in excess of 20 percent, allowing significant flexibility to the District to mitigate any emergencies or unforeseen circumstances. In addition, significant oversight of finances, financial aid, investments, and institutional assets is shared between the District and the College, depending upon how the functions are delineated. (Standards III.D.9, III.D.10)

Liabilities

The District is proactive in developing reasonable expectations in regards to financial solvency. Liabilities are clearly identified, planned for, and evaluated to ensure that sufficient financial resources are allocated. Such liabilities include Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), for which the District has established a Trust, compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. District staff are also very cognizant of impending increases in employer-sponsored pension programs and are proactively setting aside funds to cover these known future costs. (Standards III.D.11, III.D.12)

The College has no locally incurred debt instruments. Other funding sources, including auxiliary services and grants, are utilized consistent with their stated purpose. (Standard III.D.13, II.D.14)

The College monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements. The College complies with Federal Title IV regulations and maintains its student loan default rates within the acceptable range defined by the United States Department of Education. In 2016, the default rate for WHCL was 20.5%, which is well below the 30% federal compliance rate. (Standard III.D.15)

Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the College, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the College and quality of its programs, services and operations. Board policies and administrative procedures are in place to govern appropriate practices. For example, BP 6340, Bids and Contracts and related Administrative Procedures 6340, 6345 related to public contract codes, 6345 regarding construction contracts, and 6360 for contracts pertaining to electronic systems and materials. Contracts are reviewed, approved, and ratified by the Board of Trustees to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations. (Standard III.D.16)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
See College Recommendation #6

Standard IV
Leadership and Governance

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations:

The college provides ample evidence of the development and support of a culture of innovation and continuous improvement, and the College mission statement emphasizes its commitment to institutional excellence. Further, WHCL has established and practices a philosophy to create "….a culture of transparency, collegiality, inclusiveness, evidence, student learning and assessment…." This commitment is outlined in the Planning and Governance Manual which delineates the roles and responsibilities of the various participatory governance groups. College leaders encourage engagement of all constituent groups in planning and decision-making processes, and evidence shows that this occurs regularly and consistently. The Academic Senate, Associated Student Body and the Planning and Governance Council are central to these efforts. Meeting agendas and minutes confirm substantive dialogue on matters pertaining to institutional effectiveness. The District Leadership Council, comprised of faculty, staff, administrators and student representatives from across the district, provides an avenue for college constituents to participate in the development of policies, procedures and planning. The College's Planning and Governance Manual, in conjunction with Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2510, have given the college well-established and clearly defined roles for governance and decision-making. However, through direct interviews, the team found that the communication of rationales for decisions at the district level is sometimes blurred at the college level.

Findings and Evidence:

The College supports broad-based participation in decision-making and planning processes. There are formal committees and processes for all constituent groups to engage in participatory governance, and the roles and responsibilities are codified in the Planning and Governance Manual. The principal entity for governance at WHCL is the Planning and Governance Council (PGC). The PGC receives recommendations from all other committees to determine appropriate actions and priorities. Additionally the PGC reviews, revises and approves College plans and initiatives and ensures that institutional decision-making aligns with the mission, the Strategic Plan and other plans for student success and achievement, such as Student Equity (Standard IV.A.1)

District Board Policy 2510, and its related administrative procedure, provide for an inclusive process to foster collaboration in local decision-making. Policy authorizes the participation of administrators, faculty, staff, and students in governance and decision-making along with the Trustees. BP 2510 also delineates the academic and professional matters about which the Board of Trustees will consult collegially with the Academic Senates. Further, BP 2510 describes the role, membership, and structure of the District Leadership Council in relationship to the college governance councils. Agendas and reports, in addition to meeting minutes, validate appointed members and participation. (Standard IV.A.2)

Upon her arrival in 2016, the College President instituted a review of decision-making and governance roles at the College. This resulted in the collaborative publication of the Planning and Governance Manual, clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of each constituent group in decision-making, including planning and budget. The Planning and Governance Manual contains a chart detailing the participative decision making processes at all levels of the College and District. Student participation is clearly outlined in the manual, encouraging all constituencies to focus on student benefit. (Standard IV.A.3)

Administrative Procedure 2510 defines processes for decision-making and AP 4020 defines curriculum processes and review. In interviews with the College President and Curriculum Chair, the team determined that curriculum changes or additions and reviews, which occur on a 5-year cycle, originate at the respective campuses and pass through a district technical review committee, before Board approval. The district has a review test, "the rule of 7" to ensure consistency between the colleges and to protect students accessibility and completion. The College has defined Learning Areas (rather than divisions) that review the curriculum and recommend adjustment in student learning outcomes, program outcomes, and curriculum development. These recommendations flow through a well-defined process and criteria to implementation. Further, the College has developed a process flow to link Curriculum approval to budget resource planning and allocation. (Standard IV.A.4)

The team confirmed that the College gathers data and obtains diverse perspectives and recommendations from administrators, faculty, staff, and students through focus groups, surveys, campus committees, and student organizations. The institution ensures institutional matters are discussed, aligned, and implemented in a timely manner with insight from area experts. For example, when the College was considering applying for a national open educational resources grant, faculty engaged in the decision to submit an application also helped prepare the grant application. Likewise, the newly adopted Board Policy 4042 (Open Educational Resources) was widely vetted through appropriate stakeholders such as the Academic Senate and the Planning and Governance Council. (Standard IV.A.5)

The processes for decision-making at the college level are clearly defined in the Planning and Governance Manual that was developed and implemented in 2016. Additionally, BP/AP 2510, delineate decision-making. The actions of the Planning and Governance Council (PGC), college committees, and the Academic Senate are communicated campus wide each month. Although the College has sincerely attempted to communicate the planning and governance processes, results from the functional map evaluation survey, as well as verbal feedback from faculty and staff, signal the need for improved communication. The College QFE directly addresses the need for improvement in the communication and dissemination of the rationales and results of the decision making processes. (Standard IV.A.6)

The College has a self-evaluation validation process for the PGC and its subcommittees to regularly evaluate governance and decision-making structures and evaluate effectiveness of processes. Additionally, the District conducts a biennial WHCCD Committee Communication and Effectiveness Survey. The results of these evaluations are communicated through annual reports to the college community and used to make changes as needed. Further, the District has a process of evaluation for improvement, using the biennial function map survey which requests opinions on how well functions that are centralized at the District or decentralized at the colleges

are working. This information provides employee feedback to be reviewed at the annual Leadership Retreat. Other comments and suggestions, as they arise, are welcomed and discussed at the Leadership Retreat. Through these feedback processes, the College has identified a need to enhance effective communication of decision making processes across constituent groups, which led to the Quality Focus Essay topic addressed in the 2017 ISER. (Standard IV.A.7)

Conclusion:
Consistent with the challenges identified in the Quality Focus Essay, district wide communication requires strengthening. Additionally, there needs to be a more systematic process for reviewing Board policies.

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
See College Recommendation #1

Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer

General Observations:
As CEO, the College President is actively engaged in the institution and provides leadership for planning, budgeting, organizational structure, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. The team found evidence that the CEO has initiated new processes to effect change, such as convening annual campus-wide Eagle Vision Planning sessions and introducing a formal process for reviewing biennial survey data for institutional effectiveness. The College president reports to the Chancellor and is held accountable for leadership, planning and operations of the College, and according to Board Policy 2433, the President is the final authority at the college level.

Findings and Evidence:
The College president is delegated the appropriate authority and responsibility to carry out policies and procedures, via Board Policy 2433. She serves as a member of the Chancellor's Executive Cabinet, through which she participates in the development of institutional goals, policies and procedures. The team verified that the president leads annual strategic planning meetings, oversees the budget, approves hiring, and supports professional development opportunities for all campus employees. As chair of the Planning and Governance Council, the president has a central role in efforts for assessing institutional effectiveness. (Standard IV.B.1)

The administrative structure of the College is sufficient to maintain effective operations within the scope of its mission and at its current enrollment capacity. The team found that the College president delegates appropriate authority to her administrative team consistent with their departmental responsibilities and within their job descriptions. Shortly after her arrival in 2016, the College president initiated an effort to clearly define decision-making and governance roles in the Planning and Governance Manual. This was a collegial effort and, through personal interviews, the team determined it has been effective in establishing communication lines. However, the team noted that there has been some confusion of autonomy and authority lines between the College and District responsibilities. The College has identified this issue and is addressing it in aspects of its Quality Focus Essay (QFE). (Standard IV.B.2)

The team found evidence that the College President ensures institutional planning and improvement efforts are addressed through established processes and in accordance with District policies. For example, the Institutional Effectiveness and Program Review Committee monitors the program review process and verifies alignment with budget and resource allocation. Student learning outcomes and programs are monitored and assessed on a regular cyclical schedule and presented to the Planning and Governance Council for approval, to validate if program performance standards are attained in accordance with the College mission. (Standard IV.B.3)

The College President clearly has the direct responsibility for accreditation ensuring compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies, in conjunction with the District office roles, as defined in BP 3200. When the College President joined WHCL in 2106, the self-evaluation process was already well underway. However, since that time, she has been actively engaged in guiding the process while enabling the Accreditation Liaison Officer to lead the work of the Accreditation Steering Committee. To support constituent

involvement, the president hosted open campus forums in fall 2016 to solicit feedback about the accreditation process, discuss changes in governance processes, and review topics for the QFE. (Standard IV.B.4)

The CEO has the responsibility for compliance and implementation of board policies, statutes and other state and federal regulations, as well as for budget oversight and management. However, the team heard there is some role confusion between the College and District in certain operational areas, particularly related to business services functions. Further, the District, and in particular, the College has identified the need for greater communication flow in its QFE. (Standard IV.B.5)

The CEO is visible and widely recognized in the local community. She interacts regularly with local business and industry leaders, and is engaged with the Workforce Investment Board, and the King's County Economic Development Corporation. During the team site visit, community leaders attended both open forums to share their appreciation of the College's visibility and responsiveness in the community. (Standard IV.B.6)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
None

Standard IV.C Governing Board

General Observations:
The West Hills Community College District is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of seven members who are elected by geographic areas and serve staggered four-year terms. Through adopted policy and practice, the Board has authority over and responsibility for assuring academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the District.

Findings and Evidence:
The College has a seven-person governing board with authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The Board exercises its responsibility for oversight through presentations and reports at its regularly scheduled meetings and through periodic study sessions throughout the year. Similarly, to monitor the fiscal health of the District, the Board approves the annual budget and receives monthly, quarterly, and semi-annual financial reports. The Board members' diversity of viewpoints and experiences contribute to their discussions; however, once the Board reaches a decision through majority vote, members move forward in a united fashion. (Standards IV.C.1, IV.C.2, ER 7)

The WHCCD Board has established policies for selecting, delegating authority to and evaluating the Chancellor, as the CEO of the District (BP 2431- Selection, BP 2430 – Delegation and Evaluation). Evidence shows the Board follows these processes with annual evaluations of the Chancellor and most recently for the hiring of a new Chancellor to follow the retirement of the current Chancellor. (Standard IV.C.3)

The governing board follows a set of established policies to ensure it operates as an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution's educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure. For example, BP 2715 establishes a Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice. In addition, BP 2710 defines expectations to avoid Conflict of Interest. (Standard IV.C.4, ER 7)

The Board has developed and implemented policies consistent and aligned with the mission and vision of the institution to ensure quality, integrity and improvement of student learning programs. The board monitors the financial state of the District and has established a financial reserve to ensure the College has the necessary resources to deliver quality academic programs and services. (Standard IV.C.5)

Chapter two of the WHCCD Board Policies is comprised of 32 policies dedicated to the role, responsibilities, conduct, and operations of the Board of Trustees. Board policies and administrative procedures are published on the District website which is also accessible via a link on the WHCL homepage. The Board regularly reviews its policies and procedures, which are vetted through a participatory governance process. The team found that a number of policies had not been reviewed for quite some time. Policies for review are determined and published each year; however, the team could not verify that the District has a long term plan for the systematic review and revision of all Board policies. (Standards I.B.7, IV.B.6, IV.C.7)

The Board is made aware of and reviews the key indicators of student success through presentations and an annual review of the Student Success Scorecard. The Board also reviews and approved the 5-year education plan and strategic plan, including key performance indicators for the College. (Standard IV.C.8)

The Board members participate in an ongoing training program for board development and new member orientations. Two of the Board members were recently elected in 2015 and five of the Board members have served for over 19 years. The Board members have various opportunities for additional development and training through a variety of professional conferences (AACC, CCLC, ACCT, and CCLC). In addition, the Board holds an annual two-day planning retreat. The team confirmed that Board members are active in these pursuits. (Standard IV.C.9)

The Board participates in an annual retreat for self-evaluation and ongoing training on pertinent regulations, and establishes evaluation measure to assess outcomes and effectiveness. The results of the evaluation are made public on the District website. Evidence shows that the Board is committed to continuous improvement of its performance through the self-evaluation process. (Standard IV.C.10)

Board members are required to complete and file a Conflict of Interest report annually. The Board has articulated a Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, including processes for sanctioning behavior that violates code, as described in Board Policy 2715. Evidence shows that Board members adhere to the code. The Board members do not have ownership, or other personal financial interests in the institution. Additionally, policies and procedures are in place to delineate and govern Board roles and responsibilities, as well as the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and to the College President. (IV.C.4, IV.C.11, ER 7)

Board Policy 2430 delegates full authority and autonomy to the Chancellor to administer the Board Policies without interference. The Board holds the Chancellor accountable through the annual goal setting and performance evaluation process. Similarly, BP 2433 defines the authority delegated to the College President for which she, in turn, is held accountable by the Chancellor. (Standard IV.C.12)

Board Policy 3200 on Accreditation and the accompanying Administrative Procedure delineate the roles and responsibilities of the Chancellor, College President, District staff, and the College Accreditation Liaison Officers. The Chancellor keeps the Board informed of the status of accreditation and certification process and provides the Board a summary report of status and actions to be taken. Evidence shows that the Board is engaged in these processes. Three Board members participated in interviews during the team visit and appeared well-informed about the accreditation process and the requirements of the standards. (IV.C.13)

Conclusion:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendation:
District Recommendation #2 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a long- term

plan for the systematic review and revision of all Board policies and establish a formal process for documenting the review of policies in which no revisions are made. (Standard IV.C.7)

Standard IV.D: Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observation:
The West Hills Community College District, under the leadership of a Chancellor, is comprised of two comprehensive community colleges and a District Office with a shared responsibility for a service area of over 3,500 square miles covering large portions of Kings and Fresno counties and parts of San Benito, Monterey and Madera Counties. Some key operational functions are centralized at the District, such as Admissions and Records, Business Office, Human Resources, Information Technology Services, and Institutional Research. Roles and responsibilities among the District and colleges are delineated in a Function Map and reporting structures are reflected in the organizational charts. The team found that the centralized model is working in general, and increases efficiencies in most operations. However, there is some confusion in certain areas regarding authority, autonomy, and accountability between the district offices and college administration, specifically related to business services.

Findings and Evidence:
In direct interviews with District staff and college personnel, the district is a centralized model with the colleges organized in Learning Areas, rather than by departments. They are utilizing Deans, rather than faculty chair model. The Function Map defines position roles and operations throughout the district and a biennial survey is conducted on the effectiveness of the centralized and decentralized responsibilities. In interviews with the College personnel, the team found there is episodic confusion on roles from time to time, and concern that the College does not have campus level staff expertise for effective liaison with District business services, nor is there clear delegation, in practice, of direct budget responsibility. (Standard IV.D.1)

The district CEO clearly delineates district and college roles and operational responsibilities, as documented in the Function Map which is published on the District website. However, the team found that operational roles are sometimes confused between the district and the colleges. There is a current effort to review the organizational roles, based upon a recently conducted survey regarding the effectiveness of the districtwide distribution of responsibilities as defined by the Function Map. The organizational chart reflects some temporary reporting relationships and some changes are likely to occur when the new chancellor assumes responsibility in July 2017. (Standard IV.D.2)

The district CEO (chancellor) and the Board have ensured that the fiscal position of the district and the colleges is strong. Through the use of a two-day planning retreat for the Board and administration, annual goals and initiatives are established, the performance indicators from the previous year are reviewed. The budget is established beginning with program review requests submitted through the Area Budget Committees at the College. Resource requests are sent to the Budget Allocation Committee, and the College president makes priority recommendations to the District Leadership Group. After review at the District Leadership Group and approval by the Board of Trustees, the budget is administered at the District Business Services Office as part of the centralized model. Budget administration in this fashion has created some confusion at the college level regarding the authority and accountability at the college level for direct expenditures, with particular concern noted about the College president's authority over the budget. (Standard IV.D.3)

Consistent with BP 2433, the Chancellor does delegate authority for operations of the colleges to the college Presidents and holds them accountable through an annual performance evaluation. As previously noted, there is some redundancy and confusion in roles in achieving common and shared goals and initiatives. (Standard IV.D.4)

Institutional effectiveness and strategic planning are addressed in BP 3225 and BP 3250. The team confirmed that college-level plans are framed in congruence with the district strategic plan, and evidence shows that the Chancellor keeps the Board informed about student achievement and learning through a review and evaluation of Key Performance Indicators at a two-day planning retreat each year. Participants include the Board of Trustees and the District Leadership Group (DLG). The Board, in concert with the DLG, determines a plan to address any gaps and identify the resources to commit to make necessary improvements. The Function Map survey is the primary tool used to assess effectiveness of District operations. Conducted biennially, the results are shared by the Chancellor and feedback solicited at Professional Development Days and Leadership Retreats. The team found evidence that based on feedback that survey results would be more useful if separated by college, the District disaggregated the data by college and disseminated for further review. In team interviews with district personnel, including Trustees, there was discussion of having a significant amount of data available, but lacking the capacity to effectively analyze that data. The District disseminates data, communicates decisions and shares evaluative survey results, but as outlined in the QFE, there is an identified need to improve communication flow across the district. (Standards IV.D.5. IV.D.6, IV.D.7)

Conclusions:
The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations:
See College Recommendation #1

Quality Focus Essay Feedback

The West Hills College Lemoore (WHCL) Quality Focus Essay identifies two Action Projects to be addressed in order to advance institutional effectiveness. These projects align with key elements embedded in the Accreditation Standards and focus on opportunities for improvement noted by the team in this report.

The first is to enhance the use of data, outcomes, and assessment for continuous improvement, resource allocation, and strategic planning. Throughout the review of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER), and in review of evidence provided and through personal interviews conducted during the site visit, it became clear that the college and district collect much data. However, analyses of those data and the implications and impact of that information on the decision-making processes of the institution were not as clear or effective as the institution would prefer. As one Trustee stated "We have lots of data; what we don't have is much analysis".

The second Action Project is to improve internal and external communications. Many times the findings of the team pointed to an "evidence thin" process or an improvement required in communication to overcome confusion found in decision-making roles, budget allocation decisions, and strategic planning. The proposed communication audit will be beneficial in identifying barriers or breakdowns in the flow of information.

The plan set forth in the Quality Focus Essay and Institutional Reflection directly addresses these issues of data collection and analysis, and most importantly the distribution of that data to support decision-making. Further, the communication plan will enhance transparency and aid in reducing the role confusion in decision-making processes, as identified in the ISER and reiterated during direct interviews.

The projects have clearly defined step by step processes which explain purposes and rationales for each stage of implementation. Further, both projects have established goals, measures of progress, and identified responsible parties to oversee the work.

One caution of the team is that the dates of the plan indicate a completion time of the 2016-17 academic year which is overly optimistic. The team suggests that the timelines be revisited and adjusted to allow ample time for a thorough development, execution, and evaluation of each action step to achieve the anticipated outcomes and yield the results to support an integrated data-driven planning process. The team also suggests consideration of the staffing capacity needed to support robust data analytics at the college level since the research capacity is mostly at the district level.

The team noted that the QFE includes an assessment component for both Action Projects, as well as a method for making the results public. The College is to be commended for that foresight.