



*Outcomes | Innovation | Improvement*

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR  
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES  
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

---

## **CORE INQUIRIES**

Los Angeles Valley College  
5800 Fulton Avenue  
Valley Glen, CA 91401

The Core Inquiries are based upon the findings of the peer review team that conducted Team ISER Review on October 5, 2022

Dr. Eva Bagg  
Team Chair

**Contents**

Peer Review Team Roster..... 3  
Summary of Team ISER Review..... 4  
Core Inquiries..... 5

Los Angeles Valley College

Peer Review Team Roster

**Team ISER Review**

October 5, 2022

Dr. Eva Bagg, Team Chair Barstow Community College Superintendent-President	Dr. Claudia Habib, Vice Chair Porterville College President
<b>ACADEMIC MEMBERS</b>	
Ms. Kristina Allende Mt. San Antonio College Professor of English	Mr. Sam Giordanengo Hawaii Community College Associate Professor, History
Ms. Cheryl Bailey Irvine Valley College Instruction Librarian, SLO Coordinator	Mr. Arthur Hsieh Santa Rosa Junior College Faculty, EMS
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS</b>	
Ms. Lindsay Kong Diablo Valley College Interim Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation	Dr. Richard Storti San Mateo County Community College District Executive Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services
Dr. Mandy Liang City College of San Francisco Dean of Student Success	
<b>ACCJC STAFF LIAISON</b>	
Dr. Kevin Bontenbal, Vice President	

## Summary of Team ISER Review

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Valley College

DATE OF TEAM ISER REVIEW: October 5, 2022

TEAM CHAIR: Eva Bagg

A nine-member accreditation peer review team conducted Team ISER Review of Los Angeles Valley College on October 5, 2022. The Team ISER Review is a one-day, off-site analysis of an institution's self-evaluation report. The peer review team received the college's institutional self-evaluation report (ISER) and related evidence several weeks prior to the Team ISER Review. Team members found the ISER to be a comprehensive, well written, document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the ISER was developed through broad participation by the entire College community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful ISER containing self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The College also prepared a Quality Focus Essay.

In preparation for the Team ISER Review, the team chair and vice chair attended a team chair training workshop on August 3, 2022 and held a pre-review meeting with the college CEO on August 4, 2022. The entire peer review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on September 1, 2022. Prior to the Team ISER Review, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further clarification, and provided a list of requests for additional evidence to be considered during Team ISER Review.

During the Team ISER Review, team members spent the morning discussing their initial observations and their preliminary review of the written materials and evidence provided by the College for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and US ED regulations. In the afternoon, the team further synthesized their findings to validate the excellent work of the college and identified standards the college meets, as well as developed Core Inquiries to be pursued during the Focused Site Visit, which will occur in February 2023.

Core Inquiries are a means for communicating potential areas of institutional noncompliance, improvement, or exemplary practice that arise during the Team ISER Review. They describe the areas of emphasis for the Focused Site Visit that the team will explore to further their analysis to determining whether standards are met and accordingly identify potential commendations or recommendations. The college should use the Core Inquiries and time leading up to the focused site visit as an opportunity to gather more evidence, collate information, and to strengthen or develop processes in the continuous improvement cycle. In the course of the Focused Site Visit, the ACCJC staff liaison will review new or emerging issues which might arise out of the discussions on Core Inquiries.

## Core Inquiries

Based on the team's analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

### Core Inquiry 1:

The team seeks to learn more details about the college's robust viability review process, from initial triggering of the process, to conducting the review, to communication and acting upon the results.

### Standards or Policies:

I.B.9

### Description:

- a. Through review of the college website and evidence provided within the ISER, the team was impressed with the robust and data-informed nature of the college's viability review process.
- b. Evidence observed included the viability review process documents and viability standards and prior viability review reports.
- c. The team was further impressed with the college's program review modules requiring programs to address Institution Set Standards and include improvement plans in areas where the program falls below the ISS.

### Topics of discussion during interviews:

- a. **How do the different forms of initiation occur?** As described in the viability process document, these include reviews self-initiated by the discipline/department, by the PEPC through program review, by EPC as a result of EMP, etc. **Triggers and self-initiated**
- b. **What are the key processes and how are the college's governance committees** (e.g., IEC, EPC, Academic Senate, etc.) involved? **By representation?**
- c. **What information is being collected in the data finding phase of the process? How does student input inform the process?** **Data on enrollment/completions/ SLOs?**

### Student surveys

- d. What is the timeline for reviewing and setting viability triggers? PEPC reviews and sets viability triggers every ? years, known as the viability cycle.
- e. How are findings communicated and to whom? Official reports are written by a viability workgroup, which has representation from various constituencies and relevant committees (i.e. Academic Senate). The reports are also posted on the PEPC SharePoint.
- f. Is additional follow-up required at regular intervals after the viability report has been produced? Yes, through the Viability module in program review for at least one year (?)

### Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- a. Prior examples of the viability process and how results have led to the different potential outcomes (program initiation, modification and improvement, reorganization, or discontinuance).
- b. More recent examples of viability review reports 2019 – looking for Chemistry. Photography is a good example because of new pathways – two new AA/CAs
- c. Descriptions of how report findings have driven ongoing program improvement  
Viability modules are good evidence for this

### Request for Observations/Interviews:

- a. Members of the Viability Review Process Committee (Ex: Academic Senate President, VP of Instruction, PEPC chair, curriculum committee chair, EPC chair)
- b. Deans or faculty who have participated in the viability process or whose programs conducted a viability review and can describe the process from the vantage point of a program under review

### Core Inquiry 2:

The team seeks to confirm how assessment, evaluation, and student achievement data are broadly communicated to the public, including current and prospective students.

### Standards or Policies:

I.B.8 and I.C.3

**Description:**

- a. Evidence provided within the ISER documented assessment and evaluation activities, such as Program Review and learning outcome assessments, are being conducted at the college.
- b. The team was able to review program review-related information within the college SharePoint; however, the team noted several examples of links related to program review on the public site being broken links or areas where navigation to website information was unclear.
- c. The team had difficulty locating on the public-facing website information related to assessment results of institution set standards, program review, and SLOs.

**Topics of discussion during interviews:**

- a. How does a member of the public access student achievement data? OIE dashboards
- b. What is the timeline/current process for college website migration and updates? Unknown, but migration is completed. Waiting on access to edit.
- c. What is the decision-making process for location of information? ??
- d. What information does the college intend to make available on its website and in SharePoint? Website contains student- and public-facing data, while the SharePoint is designed for faculty/staff/administrators

**Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**

- a. Timeline for website migration
- b. Documentation that is guiding or description of how it is determined what information will be made public on the college website and what will be made available in SharePoint
- c. Demonstration of how a member of the public can access assessment and evaluation-related information

**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. PEPC and/or the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, and/or the VP of Academic Affairs

- b. Website manager, Public Information Officer or individuals who are conducting the website migration work



ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR  
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES  
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

## **DISTRICT CORE INQUIRIES**

Los Angeles Community College District  
770 Wilshire Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA 90017



The Core Inquiries are based upon the findings of the peer review team that conducted Team ISER Review on October 7, 2022

Mr. Michael Claire  
Team Chair

## Contents

Peer Review Team Roster.....	10
Summary of Team ISER Review.....	11
Core Inquiries.....	12

Los Angeles Community College District

Peer Review Team Roster

**Team ISER Review**

October 7, 2022

Michael Claire, Team Chair San Mateo County Community College District Chancellor	Dr. David Martin, Vice Chair San Francisco Community College District Chancellor
<b>ACADEMIC MEMBERS</b>	
Dr. Fail Cammin Foothill College Program Director, Humanities Mellon Scholars Program	Dr. Bridget Herrin San Diego Mesa College Dean, Institutional Effectiveness
Dr. Michelle Miller-Galaz Porterville College Dean of Instruction	Dr. Jia Sun Imperial Valley College Associate Professor/Accreditation Coordinator
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS</b>	
Ms. Kelly Avila Merced College Associate Vice President of Human Resources	Ms. Ann-Marie Gabel South Orange Community College District Vice Chancellor, Business Services
Mr. William McGinnis Butte-Glenn Community College District Trustee	Dr. Ivan Peña Crafton Hills College Dean of Student Equity and Success
<b>ACCJC STAFF LIASON</b>	
Dr. Kevin Bontenbal, Vice President	

## **Summary of District Team ISER Review**

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Community College District

DATE OF TEAM ISER REVIEW: October 7, 2022

TEAM CHAIR: Michael Claire

A ten-member accreditation peer review team conducted Team ISER Review of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) on October 7, 2022. The primary focus of the team was to review standards IV.C and IV.D. The Team ISER Review is a one-day, off-site analysis of an institution's self-evaluation report. The peer review team received the institutional self-evaluation report (ISER) for each college in the LACCD and related evidence several weeks prior to the Team ISER Review. Team members found the narrative for Standards IV.C and IV.D of the ISERs to be comprehensive and well written.

In preparation for the Team ISER Review, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on August 3, 2022 and held a pre-review meeting with the district ALO on October 3, 2022. The entire peer review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on August 31, 2022. Prior to the Team ISER Review, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further clarification, and provided a list of requests for additional evidence to be considered during Team ISER Review.

During the Team ISER Review, team members spent the meeting discussing their initial observations and their preliminary review of the written materials and evidence provided by the colleges for the purpose of determining whether the colleges continue to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and US ED regulations with an emphasis on Standards IV.C and IV.D. The team developed Core Inquiries to be pursued during the Focused Site Visit, which will occur in March 2023

Core Inquiries are a means for communicating potential areas of institutional noncompliance, improvement, or exemplary practice that arise during the Team ISER Review. They describe the areas of emphasis for the Focused Site Visit that the team will explore to further their analysis to determining whether standards are met and accordingly identify potential commendations or recommendations. The District should use the Core Inquiries and time leading up to the focused site visit as an opportunity to gather more evidence, collate information, and to strengthen or develop processes in the continuous improvement cycle. In the course of the Focused Site Visit, the ACCJC staff liaison will review new or emerging issues which might arise out of the discussions on Core Inquiries.

## District Core Inquiries

Based on the team’s analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

<b>District Core Inquiry 1:</b> The team seeks to verify the board has an orientation for new board members as outlined under policy.
<b>Standards or Policies:</b> IV.C.9
<b>Description:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. As outlined in BP 2740 – <i>Board Education</i> the Board is committed to ongoing development as a Board and to a trustee education program, including a new trustee orientation.</li><li>b. Board Members attend conferences, such as the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) for professional development.</li><li>c. The Committee of the Whole often holds in-depth sessions to allow for better understanding of major focus areas, for example budget and AB 705.</li><li>d. The team did not find evidence of a formal new trustee orientation.</li></ul>
<b>Topics of discussion during interviews:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. How are new board members informed of board orientations?</li><li>b. What orientation opportunities are provided for new board members?</li><li>c. When was the last new board member orientation?</li><li>d. Who participates in board orientation?</li></ul>
<b>Request for Additional Information/Evidence:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. New board member orientation agenda.</li><li>b. Documentation of Professional Development Opportunities.</li></ul>
<b>Request for Observations/Interviews:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Board members</li><li>b. Chancellor</li></ul>

<b>District Core Inquiry 2:</b> The team seeks to better understand how the district determines resource allocation and reallocation is adequate to support effective operation across the district.
<b>Standards or Policies:</b> IV.D.3

**Description:**

- a. The team reviewed the district’s allocation model and evidence that the district is following its model.
- b. The team was unclear on how the district assess its resource allocation model to determine its adequacy and effectiveness in supporting all colleges across the district.

**Topics of discussion during interviews:**

- a. What are the effective controls of expenditures?
- b. What is the process for evaluating the resource allocation model?
- d. What is the process for colleges in the district to request more resources in order to meet operational needs?

**Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**

- a. Resource model evaluations.
- b. Evidence of district-wide discussions regarding the evaluations of the resource allocation model.

**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. Chancellor
- b. District Chief Business Officer (or CFO)
- c. District budget committee

**District Core Inquiry 3:** The team would like to learn about the process of development and what follow-up has occurred from the release of the district’s framework for racial equity and social justice.

**Standards or Policies:** IV.D.1

**Description:**

- a. The team was impressed with the district's Framework of Equity and Social Justice and its alignment with district mission, board goals, and district goals.

**Topics of discussion during interviews:**

- a. Where did this framework originate?
- b. How did the district determine a Race, Equity, and Inclusion workgroup?
- c. How does this district use these principles to guide decision-making?

**Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**

- a. Committee roster of Race, Equity, and Inclusion workgroup.
- b. Agendas and minutes from the district’s Race, Equity, and Inclusion workgroup.
- c. Evidence of district-wide communication regarding actions and/or recommendations of the Race, Equity, and Inclusion workgroup.

**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. Chief Human Resources Officer
- b. Race, Equity, and Inclusion workgroup
- c. Individuals involved in the development of the Framework of Equity and Social Justice

