Los Angeles Southwest College 2015 Midterm Report Executive Summary

The Mid-term Report is intended to demonstrate to the Commission that the changes implemented in the past two Follow-up Reports to resolve the deficiencies and meet Eligibility Requirements and Standards have been sustained.

In March 2012, an ACCJC evaluation team conducted a comprehensive evaluation site visit to Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC). The final evaluation team report contained six recommendations to help the College come into compliance with the Standards. At its June 2012 meeting, the Commission voted to issue a sanction of Probation to the College. As a result of this sanction, the Commission directed the College to submit a Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2013, and to show that it resolved the six recommendations.

In March 2013, the College submitted a Follow-Up Report to the Commission, describing the actions that it took to fulfill the requirement to resolve the six College recommendations and five District recommendations (Follow-Up Report, March 15, 2013). In April 2013, members of the evaluation team returned to the College and met with staff on April 16, 2013. At its June 2013 meeting, the Commission concluded that the College resolved two of the six recommendations, that it had partially implemented three of the four remaining recommendations and that it had not satisfactorily responded to one of the recommendations. The Commission then acted to place the College on Warning and directed the College to prepare and submit a second Follow-Up Report, this time describing the resolution of the four remaining recommendations and asking it to address how the College was in full compliance with the Standards cited in the July 3, 2013 letter from the Commission.

In March 2014, the College submitted a second Follow-Up Report to the Commission, describing the actions that it took to fulfill the requirement to resolve the four College recommendations and five District recommendations (Follow-Up Report, March 15, 2014). In April 2014, members of the evaluation team returned to the College and met with staff on April 14, 2014. At its June 2014 meeting, the Commission concluded that the College resolved the remaining four recommendations, took action to remove the college from Warning and reaffirm accreditation.

In preparation for the 2016 ACCJC Team visit, an Accreditation Kick-off was held this past fall for the campus community to learn more about what we must do, together, to make sure that LASC continues in its current accredited status, and well into the future!

Ongoing activities are underway to establish standard teams and develop 2016 Self Evaluation Report.
**Certification Page**

**TO:** Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

**FROM:**
Linda Rose, Ed.D.
President, Los Angeles Southwest College
1600 W. Imperial Highway
Los Angeles, CA 90047

We certify that there was broad participation in the production of the 2015 Accreditation Midterm Report by the college community, that the report accurately reflects actions taken by the college and district to address the recommendations, and that the report was presented to the Board of Trustees for review prior to submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Svonkin</td>
<td>President, Board of Trustees</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco C. Rodriguez</td>
<td>Chancellor, L.A. Community College District</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Linda Rose</td>
<td>President, Los Angeles Southwest College</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lawrence Bradford</td>
<td>Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allison Moore</td>
<td>President, Academic Senate</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassaundra Walker</td>
<td>Chair, AFT College Staff Guild – 1521A</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sandra Lee</td>
<td>LASC Chapter President, AFT Faculty Guild – 1521</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Blackburn</td>
<td>President, ASO</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bradley</td>
<td>Local 99 SEIU</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Bebelle</td>
<td>Local 721 Supervisory</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Crown</td>
<td>Local 45 Crafts</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Report Preparation
In order to prepare for the 2015 Midterm Report, the Los Angeles Southwest College Accreditation Steering Committee was convened in fall 2014. This group (the College President, Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair, ALO/Administrative Accreditation Co-Chair, and Dean of Institutional Effectiveness) worked closely with College faculty, staff, and administrators to prepare the Report. To ensure widespread College involvement in the Midterm Report, the Steering Committee formed sub-committees and developed a timeline and work plans. Throughout the fall, winter, and spring, the College worked on addressing the recommendations, and updating the Board of Trustees, faculty, administration, staff, and students on the College’s progress.

On October 24th, 2014, at the fall 2014 Accreditation Kickoff, an update on the report and the timeline for its completion was given to faculty, staff, administrators and students. A draft of the Midterm Report was then made available to the College Council on December 1, 2014, and to the LASC Academic Senate and the college community on December 15, 2014. Feedback was obtained from these groups, and the final Report was approved by the Academic Senate on February 17th, 2015, the College Council on March 2nd, 2015, and the Associated Students Organization on March 3rd, 2015. The Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees reviewed and approved the Report on February 11th, 2015.

Linda Rose, Ed.D.
President
Los Angeles Southwest College
Midterm Report Introduction

In March 2012, an ACCJC evaluation team conducted a comprehensive evaluation site visit to Los Angeles Southwest College. The final evaluation team report contained six College Recommendations to help the College come into compliance with Accreditation Standards. At its June 2012 meeting, the Commission voted to issue a sanction of Probation to the College. As a result of this sanction, the Commission directed the college to submit a Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2013, and to show that it resolved the six recommendations.

In March 2013, the College submitted a Follow-Up Report to the Commission, describing the actions that it took to fulfill the requirement to resolve the six Recommendations (Follow-Up Report, March 15, 2013). Members of the evaluation team returned to the college and met with staff on April 16, 2013.

At its June 2013 meeting, the Commission concluded that the college resolved two of the six recommendations in the Follow-Up Report and that it had partially implemented one of the four remaining Recommendations. The Commission acted to place the College on Warning and directed the College to prepare and submit a second Follow-Up Report, this time describing the resolution of the four remaining Recommendations and asking it to address how the college was in full compliance with the standards cited in the July 3, 2013 letter from the Commission.

The second Follow-Up Report was submitted to the ACCJC on March 15, 2014. This Report described the actions that the College took to resolve the remaining four Recommendations, and its compliance with the Standards cited in the July 3, 2013 Commission letter. Members of the evaluation team returned to the college and met with staff on April 14, 2014.

At its June 2014 meeting, the Commission concluded the College had resolved the remaining four Recommendations. The Commission acted to remove Warning and reaffirm accreditation.

This Midterm Report describes the College’s continued progress on the six College Recommendations and the five District Recommendations. It also describes the College’s progress towards completion of the ten Planning Agenda Items identified in the 2012 Self-Study Report. Finally, there is an update on the College’s plans to submit a Substantive Change Report.
Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Action Letter

College Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college validate the current planning model by formally assessing the effectiveness of the process with qualitative and quantitative data. Further, the team recommends the College be attentive to the regular and consecutive implementation of the annual process and document the results for dissemination to the college constituency for the purpose of program improvement. (IB.3, IB.4, IB.6).

This Recommendation was initially addressed in the College’s 2013 Follow-Up Report. Based on that report and the subsequent visit, the College received a Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report, which stated that this Recommendation had been fully addressed and that the Standard had been met (CR1.1 – 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report, CR1.2 – July 3, 2013 ACCJC Action Letter). The steps that the College took to resolve this Recommendation are outlined below.

Each year, the College holds an annual planning retreat with faculty, staff, administrators, and students. At the 2012 retreat, a comprehensive assessment of the college planning process was undertaken. Quantitative data was obtained through a survey of participant knowledge of the strategic planning process. Qualitative data was gathered through focus groups on how to improve the process. Results indicated that attendees had a limited understanding of the strategic planning process (CR1.3 – 2012 Strategic Planning Retreat Materials). Further, the focus groups suggested that the campus community was dissatisfied with the process, and that a lack of communication and resources have been a problem (CR1.4 – LASC Planning Process Focus Group Report). Based on this feedback, a follow-up workshop was convened in order to provide attendees with detailed information on the college planning process and to gain feedback on how to improve it (CR1.5 – 2012 SPC Workshop Materials). The feedback centered around two main issues: consolidation of campus committees and revision of the strategic planning handbook. Revision of the planning handbook began in earnest in spring 2013, and a draft was presented to the Strategic Planning Committee on October 3, 2013 for discussion (CR1.6 – October 3, 2013 Strategic Planning Committee minutes). The committee noted that the handbook is easier to read and more intuitive than its predecessor. It includes more graphics and also has a description of the Accreditation Standards that are relevant to each step in the planning process. Additional revisions to the handbook are ongoing. An approved final version is expected to be completed in spring 2015.

To address the consolidation of campus committees, the Strategic Planning Committee performed an assessment of committee functions and membership at its December 6, 2012 meeting (CR1.7 – December 6, 2012 Strategic Planning Committee minutes). This assessment was framed by the 2012-2013 LASC Functional Map document (CR1.8 – LASC Functional Map), and resulted in approved SPC recommendations to restructure, combine, or eliminate specific campus committees.
These recommendations were approved by the Academic Senate (CR1.9 – March 12, 2013 Academic Senate minutes) and the College Council in the spring of 2013 (CR1.10 – April 8, 2013 College Council minutes). To evaluate the effectiveness of the consolidated structure, committee self-evaluations were completed in spring 2014. These evaluations summarized committee actions, progress towards committee goals, and attendance at each meeting (CR1.11 – LASC Committee Self-Evaluation Form). They were reviewed at the May 29, 2014 Strategic Planning Committee meeting (CR1.12 – May 29, 2014 Strategic Planning Committee minutes).

Since the 2013 Follow-Up Report, the annual planning process has continually improved. In fall 2014, the annual program review and planning process was moved to a new online system. This system addressed the college’s needs in a number of ways. First, it improved the transparency of the process, which ensured that program plans were widely disseminated for the purpose of program improvement. At each step of the process, program reviews are available to view on the program review website (CR1.13 – Screenshot Program Review Committee webpage).

This allows the program’s faculty and staff to easily view their objectives for the coming year. The revised form is broken into modules for each goal of the college strategic plan. Programs analyze program-specific data for each goal, identify areas for improvement, and then set objectives to improve upon those areas. Resource allocation requests that are necessary for the attainment of program objectives are also captured. After setting annual objectives for each goal
of the strategic plan, programs receive a summary table of all their objectives for the coming year. In this summary table, they prioritize their objectives and associated resource requests. As a result, the College, the public, and all programs have 24/7 access to program objectives and resource requests. At the end of the 2014-2015 annual program review process, the LASC Program Review Committee will evaluate this process and make any changes that are necessary for continuous improvement.

Evidence

CR1.1 – 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
CR1.2 – July 3, 2013 ACCJC Action Letter
CR1.3 – 2012 Strategic Planning Retreat Materials
CR1.4 – LASC Planning Process Focus Group Report
CR1.5 – 2012 SPC Workshop Materials
CR1.6 – October 3, 2013 Strategic Planning Committee minutes
CR1.7 – December 6, 2012 Strategic Planning Committee minutes
CR1.8 – LASC Functional Map
CR1.9 – March 12, 2013 Academic Senate minutes
CR1.10 – April 8, 2013 College Council minutes
CR1.11 – LASC Committee Self-Evaluation Form
CR1.12 – May 29, 2014 Strategic Planning Committee minutes
CR1.13 – Screenshot Program Review Committee webpage

**College Recommendation 2**

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College maintains a functional website to encourage communication, particularly in the following areas: 1) information on programs and services for students, and 2) information and documentation on governance and other committee activities. (IIA.2.b, IIA.2.h, IIA.2.i, IIA.6.c).

This Recommendation was initially addressed in the College’s 2013 Follow-Up Report. Based on that report, and the subsequent visit, the College received a Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report, which stated that this Recommendation had been fully addressed and that the Standard had been met. (CR2.1 – 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report, CR2.2 – July 3, 2013 ACCJC Action Letter). The steps that the College took to resolve this Recommendation are outlined below.
To address the problem and find a permanent solution, the College contracted AMF Media, a web design firm (CR2.3. – Contract with AMF media) on October 1, 2012, to completely redesign the website to improve functionality, organization, content, and ADA compliance in order to meet the needs of the College community. The firm met with key campus stakeholders (CR2.4 – Stakeholder meeting sign-in sheet) to get initial direction for the redesign and to gain an understanding of the College’s needs. The College also held multiple focus groups with faculty, staff, and students (CR2.5 – Website Focus Group Results). The results of the focus groups were analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and then shared with the web designers to ensure that the end-design would reflect an inclusive site that would be beneficial to all campus stakeholders.

The work of the web design firm was limited due to the timing of the contract and the availability of faculty and staff to work with them on the redesign of the website. As a result, the College hired a Public Information Officer (PIO) in 2012 to take the lead in modifying the website (CR2.6 – PIO Job Announcement). The PIO’s responsibilities explicitly included overseeing website maintenance, managing the College web design team, and conducting outreach via social networks. The PIO synthesized the focus group data, and developed a website policy (CR2.7 – LASC Website Policy) that provides guidelines for the regular update and maintenance of the website to ensure timely and accurate content. This policy was approved by the Academic Senate on March 25, 2014 (CR2.8 – March 25, 2014 Academic Senate minutes) and by the College Council on February 3, 2014 (CR2.9 – February 3, 2014 College Council minutes).

The PIO oversaw the redesign of the entire college website and made sure that the website was functional, and contained information on programs and services for students and information and documentation on governance and other committee activities. This redesign included substantial revisions to the Admissions and Records, Counseling, Transfer Center, Financial Aid, Veteran’s Services, Bookstore, Business Office, and Department/Program pages. Further, the class schedule and catalog are easily accessed through a single click from the LASC homepage (CR2.10 – Screenshot of LASC Homepage).
Students can now view a list of all sections, as well as the number of open seats that are available in each one (CR2.11 – Screenshot of Open Class List).

In spring 2013, an online survey was developed to assess the website's functionality by online users. The survey was developed by the PIO in collaboration with the Technology Committee, Associated Student Organization, and the Council of Chairs. The survey was completed by 121 students, faculty, staff, and administrators responded. More than 93% of respondents indicated that there was either a big improvement to the website, or that the website had somewhat improved. Approximately 80% of respondents indicated that they were able to find what they needed from the homepage, and 75% of respondents indicated that the website menus allow them to find information easily (CR2.12 – LASC Website Survey Results). In an effort to continue to meet the standard and continue to improve communication on programs and services for students, information and documentation on governance and other committee activities, the college will conduct a website functionality survey in spring 2015.
The College also took steps to improve the information and documentation on governance and committee activities. The College Committee webpage can be directly accessed from the LASC homepage (CR2.10 – Screenshot of LASC Homepage).

In fall 2014, the campus moved the committee websites to the SharePoint web environment. This allowed for committees to easily post their agendas and minutes to their webpage. For a more detailed discussion of this effort, please see the response to College Recommendation 6.

Evidence
CR2.1 – 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
CR2.2 – July 3, 2013 ACCJC Action Letter
CR2.3 – Contract with AMF media
CR2.4 – Stakeholder meeting sign-in sheet
CR2.5 – Website Focus Group Results
CR2.6 – PIO Job Announcement
CR2.7 – LASC Website Policy
CR2.8 – March 25, 2014 Academic Senate minutes
CR2.9 – February 3, 2014 College Council minutes
CR2.10 – Screenshot of LASC Homepage
CR2.11 – Screenshot of Open Class List
CR2.12 – LASC Website Survey Results

**College Recommendation 3**

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College review the availability of appropriate, comprehensive and reliable services to all students. In particular, the team urges the college to review the parity of services provided to students in distance education as compared to students on campus. (IIIB.3.a)

This Recommendation was initially addressed in the College’s 2013 Follow-Up Report and subsequently in the College’s 2014 Follow-Up Report. Based on the College’s 2014 Follow-Up Report and the subsequent visit, the College received a Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report and Action Letter, which stated that the College had addressed this Recommendation (CR3.1 – 2014 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report; CR3.2 – July 3, 2014 ACCJC Action Letter). The steps that the College has taken to resolve this Recommendation are outlined below.
The College continues to focus its efforts on providing student services for online as well as face-to-face students, in particular through Admissions, Orientation, the matriculation process, counseling, academic support, and career services. These interventions provide equitable services for all students who attend the college (CR3.3 - Screenshot of About LASC Online webpage).

### Admissions and the matriculation process

The Office of Admissions continues to provide a variety of services to both online and land based students. All students may complete and submit an online application for admissions to the College. Once they complete the matriculation process, students can also register for classes online or in-person. Once students have applied to the college, they have access to the District Student Information System. There, students may complete a variety of tasks online, including registering for classes, viewing their placement scores, schedule, grades, changing their PIN, viewing and paying their fees, printing an unofficial transcript, viewing holds, and accessing their financial aid status and award letter information (CR3.4 - Screenshot of District Student Information System webpage).
Counseling

The College has been providing online counseling services since spring 2012. This allows students to contact a counselor online for support and information. There are several methods that students are able to access a counselor online. They include:

- *Ask-A-Counselor* – Nonstudents too - email service that provides answers to quick questions that off-campus/online students have about degree requirements, transfer information, course offerings, etc. This service’s use and effectiveness was evaluated in spring 2013, changes were then made to address identified deficiencies, and a re-evaluation was done in winter 2014 (*CR3.5 – Winter 2014 Online Counseling Services Evaluation Report*). As a result of this re-evaluation, further refinements have been made to the system. Another evaluation is scheduled to take place in spring 2015.

- *E-SARS* – online scheduling system for Counseling appointments. In a winter 2014 evaluation of E-SARS, it was noted that few students had actually used the system. Of those who had used it, the majority were satisfied with it (*CR3.5 – Winter 2014 Online Counseling Services Evaluation Report*). As a result, the Counseling department began actively marketing the system. To determine the effectiveness of these efforts, another evaluation is scheduled to take place in spring 2015.

- *E-Advising* – allows students to communicate with a counselor through an online system. In a winter 2014 evaluation of E-Advising, it was noted that few students had actually used the system. Of those who had used it, the majority were satisfied with it (*CR3.5 – Winter 2014 Online Counseling Services Evaluation Report*). As a result, the Counseling department began actively marketing the system. To determine the effectiveness of these efforts, another evaluation is scheduled to take place in spring 2015.

- *Contact Your Counselor* - online form system to submit inquiries to a specific counselor or to any available counselor. EOPS, etc. An evaluation of this system is scheduled for spring 2015.

All students are able to access all these services from the Counseling website and email any counselor (by program or individual counselor) and or access E-SARS and E-Advising (*CR3.6 - Screenshot of Counseling webpage*).
The Counseling website also provides students with a wealth of information on college procedures and policies, degree requirements, transfer, and other relevant topics.

**Orientation**

Beginning in spring 2015, the College will offer students the option of using an online student orientation called Cynosure. Cynosure will enable all students to complete the orientation process anywhere and anytime. The new system will also be able to interface with the District’s new Student Information System to report all students who have completed their orientation as part of the Student Success and Support Program Act (CR3.7 - Screenshot of Cynosure Online Orientation).
Academic Support

The college is committed to providing academic support for all students. Smart Thinking is an online, interactive tutoring system designed to provide students access to tutorial services 24/7. This system has been operational at LASC since November 15, 2012. Students have access to a variety of subject areas, including, writing, reading, mathematics, natural sciences, business, English for speakers of other languages, Spanish, nursing and allied health, and computers and technology. Students may receive 10 free hours of tutorial services per semester and are able to purchase more time if needed (CR3.8 - Screenshot of Smart Thinking webpage). An evaluation of Smart Thinking was performed in 2013, and indicated that most students who used it felt that it helped them understand their subject matter better. However, student use of the system was not very widespread (CR3.9 - Smart Thinking evaluation report). As a result, a link to Smart Thinking was pre-loaded into all Etudes online course shells, the Student Success Center sent faculty information about it, and students were emailed reminders about it. To determine how well these methods worked, an evaluation is scheduled for spring 2015.

Another academic support service the College provides is Student Lingo (CR3.10 - Screenshot of Student Lingo webpage). Student Lingo provides students with a series of online workshops that help them to achieve their academic, personal, and career goals. There are four areas of concentration covered in this program:

- Personal management
- Learning support
- Reading and writing
- Academic and career exploration

An evaluation of Smart Thinking was performed in 2013, and indicated that most students were satisfied with the system. Further, unlike some of the other online services offered on campus, a
A large number of students used the system (CR3.11 – Student Lingo evaluation report). In fact, the college was contacted by the Smart Thinking company and asked what methods were used to increase usage so that they could be shared with other colleges. Another evaluation of Student Lingo is scheduled for spring 2015.

Career Services

The Career Center provides students with individual and group counseling, vocational testing services, exploration of career options, and information on occupational fields and employment trends. A counselor and assistants are available to assist students in developing skills for self-assessment, information gathering, decision making, and goal setting as a part of their career development and planning. Services also include career development classes, career workshops, and computer resources for the latest career information.

In addition to counseling and academic online support services, all students have access to an online career assessment known as EUREKA (CR3.12 - Screenshot of Career Center webpage). This program allows students to explore work preferences and aptitudes, search wages, duties, and skills of various occupations, and provides a guide for how to start a job search. This system was implemented online in January 2014, and an evaluation of its usage and effectiveness are scheduled for spring 2015.
Evidence

CR3.1 – 2014 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
CR3.2 – July 3, 2014 ACCJC Action Letter
CR3.3 – Screenshot of About LASC Online webpage
CR3.4 – Screenshot of District Student Information System webpage
CR3.5 – Winter 2014 Online Counseling Services Evaluation Report
CR3.6 – Screenshot of Counseling webpage
CR3.7 – Screenshot of Cynosure Online Orientation
CR3.8 – Screenshot of Smart Thinking webpage
CR3.9 – Smart Thinking evaluation report
CR3.10 – Screenshot of Student Lingo webpage
CR3.11 – Student Lingo evaluation report
CR3.12 – Screenshot of Career Center webpage
College Recommendation 4

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the library regularly update its print and online collections in consultation with discipline faculty. (II C.1.a). The team further recommends that, to meet the stated Student Learning Outcome in Information Competency, the College implement a cycle of instruction, assessment, and program improvement through appropriate learning resource and instructional areas of the College (IIC.1.b). Finally, the team recommends that a sustainable funding source be identified for the acquisition and maintenance of learning resource materials. (IIC.1 , II.C.2, IIID.1.a)

This Recommendation was initially addressed in the College’s 2013 Follow-Up Report and subsequently in the College’s 2014 Follow-Up Report. Based on the 2014 Follow-Up Report, and the subsequent visit, the College received a Follow-up Visit Evaluation Report and Commission Action Letter, which stated that the College had addressed this Recommendation, had resolved the deficiencies, and now met the Standards cited in the Recommendation (CR4.1 – 2014 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report; CR4.2 – July 3, 2014 ACCJC Action Letter). The steps the College took to address this Recommendation are outlined below.

Library Collection

Thanks to the bond construction program, the College will open a $38.8 million Library/Learning Assistance Center in spring 2015, which includes reading rooms, individual study carrels, group study rooms, library stacks, two smart classrooms with smart boards, two computer labs with 48 new student-use computers, librarian offices, and a workroom. The library will also provide Wi-Fi and open spaces for students who want to use their own devices or study. (CR4.4 –LASC Bond Program Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment Budget for the Library)

To suitably stock a brand new, state-of-the-art $38.8 million Library/Learning Assistance Center, the College developed and implemented an ongoing, annual process to regularly update and assess its library collection. In 2011-2012, a major de-selection project was completed that resulted in the elimination of 17,000 obsolete titles from the collection. During 2012-2013, the Library completed a two-year materials acquisitions plan and revised the collection development policy to help ensure that its holdings remain current. To that end, faculty recommended discipline-relevant titles that were then compiled into a 3,301-title acquisitions list (CR4.3 – LASC Library Acquisitions List). A one-time $250,000 allocation for print and electronic books and other library materials was used to fund the titles on this list (CR4.5 – LASC Library 2013-2014 Acquisition Plan for Library Remodel). As part of the five-year budget plan, the College has committed an additional $50,000 per year to update the print and electronic library collection. As an external check on the validity of this process, the Library Advisory Committee meets regularly to review the acquisition plan and offer feedback (CR4.6 –Library Advisory Committee Minutes, December 15, 2014).

In addition to updating the physical resources of the library, the College has also allocated funds to increase the library’s human resources. One new full-time librarian will begin work in spring
2015, in addition to a number of part-time librarians. This will allow the library to expand its hours, and also better respond to student requests for assistance.

In sum, the College has vastly improved the operations of the library on multiple fronts. Beginning in spring 2015, the Library/Learning Assistance Center will be housed in a $38.8 million state-of-the-art facility. The print and electronic collection will be regularly assessed and updated with titles that are directly relevant to campus programs. The personnel and hours of operation will be greatly expanded. The effect that these improvements will have on the College’s ability to meet the needs of its students, faculty, and staff cannot be understated.

**Information Competency**

The library continues to implement a full cycle of instruction, assessment, and program improvement related to the College’s Information Competency ISLO. Specifically, library staff have collaborated with the English Department to teach and assess the College’s Information Competency ISLO for multiple semesters.

In fall 2013, the College information competency ISLO was assessed in English 21 and 28. These are the two lowest-level courses in the English course sequence. The results of this assessment indicated that students in those levels have challenges understanding differences between scholarly information sources and non-scholarly internet sources. *(CR4.7 - Information Competency Report)*. To determine whether students gain understanding in this area by the time they reach college-level English, the same assessment will be performed in English 101 (i.e. College Reading and Composition I) and English 103 (Composition and Critical Thinking) in spring 2015. At the end of spring 2015, English faculty and librarians will participate in a debriefing to analyze this ISLO assessment data. They will then develop and implement strategies to ensure improvement. Further, they will begin exploring ways to integrate the information competency ISLO into the overall college curriculum rather than relying solely on one department to meet an ISLO.

The library also offers information competency instruction orientations. To assess information competency learning, pre-test and post-test assessments are included in all orientations *(CR4.8 - fall 2014 pre-test/post-test assessments)*. As a result of these assessments, orientations are refined to ensure that students are gaining and retaining the relevant information. Once the renovated library opens in spring 2015, the library will also be able to determine how the results change in response to the new technology and facility.

Evidence


CR4.2 – July 3, 2014 ACCJC Action Letter

CR4.3 – LASC Library Acquisitions List

CR.4.4 – LASC Bond Program Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment Budget for the Library
College Recommendation 5

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College reviews all aspects of professional development, including key elements of peer review, self-reflection, and continuous review of appropriate pedagogy for the student population. In particular, the completion of faculty evaluations systematically and at stated intervals; engagement in dialogue addressing staff and faculty professional development on various teaching pedagogies and strategies to meet the diverse learning styles of its diverse student population. (IIIA.1.b)

This Recommendation was initially addressed in the College’s 2013 Follow-Up Report and subsequently in the College's 2014 Follow-Up Report. Based on the 2014 Follow-Up Report, and the subsequent visit, the College received a Follow-up Visit Evaluation Report and Commission Action Letter, which stated that the College had addressed this Recommendation, had resolved the deficiencies, and now met the Standards cited in the Recommendation (CR5.1 – 2014 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report; CR5.2 – July 3, 2014 ACCJC Action Letter). The steps that the College has taken to resolve this Recommendation and continue to improve are outlined below.

Faculty Evaluations

As noted in the 2014 follow-up report, beginning in 2011, a new process was developed to ensure that all full-time and part-time faculty evaluations are completed systematically and on time; and this process is still being followed rigorously (CR5.1 - 2014 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report; CR5.3 – Faculty Evaluations Sent to the District Office).

Evaluations are designed to provide all employees with an assessment of their work performance. Article 19 (Appendix C, Section 1) of the Faculty Union Contract spells out the components of faculty evaluations. The College incorporates peer review and self-reflection of teaching effectiveness into the faculty evaluation process. Each faculty member has a Peer Review Committee. The committee is tasked with giving feedback to instructors based on a self-reflection submitted by the faculty member, classroom observations such as knowledge of subject matter, course syllabi, sample class assignments, and student evaluations. This peer review and self-reflection is an integral part of each faculty member’s evaluation. If recommendations have been made, they must be incorporated into the next evaluation of the faculty member, including any improvement plan if the faculty member receives “needs to improve” or “unsatisfactory” ratings (CR5.4 – Article 19, Appendix C; Sample Improvement Plan).
Professional Development

Since the 2014 Follow-Up Visit, the Professional Development Committee and the Faculty Academy has continued conducting multiple activities to promote staff and faculty professional development on various teaching pedagogies and strategies to meet the range of learning styles of its diverse student population (CR5.5 – 2014 LASC Faculty Academy Flyer).

LASC continues to implement the professional development activities spelled out in the 2013-2016 Professional Development Plan (CR5.6 – 2013-2016 Professional Development plan). These activities include the following:

- As part of the spring 2014 Flex Program, a Professional Development Survey was issued to the faculty to survey their attitudes on what types of activities they might be more likely to attend (CR5.7 – spring 2014 Professional Development Survey; CR5.8 – Spring 2014 Professional Development Survey results).
- On March 7, 2014, the Professional Development Committee hosted the Great Teachers Seminar Flyer on campus (CR5.9 – Great Teachers Seminar Flyer; CR5.10 – Great Teachers Seminar sign-in list).
- On March 28, 2014, April 28, 2014, and May 16, 2014, the LASC Faculty Academy held workshops that addressed such topics as classroom pedagogy, developing meaningful outcomes, models for project based learning, student reflection, and evaluation methods, and other topics that deal with enhancing instruction (CR5.11 - LASC Faculty Academy Spring 2014 Flyer).
- LASC purchased the 20 Minute Mentor Series in spring 2014. The 20 Minute Mentor Commons is an affordable, subscription priced online collection of targeted faculty development programs, grounded in sound educational theory, that offer solutions to common classroom challenges—in just 20 minutes. This series of Webinars is available to all employees, and can be accessed via the Internet using any device capable of accessing the Internet. The series provides several advantages including online and on-demand access from any computer with an Internet connection; targeted fast and focused solutions that instructors can use today; campus-wide access to all programs for an entire year; flexibility to watch seminars at home, at work, in a group, on a tablet, or even on a phone; and transcripts for each program (CR5.12 – 20 Minute Mentor Professional Opportunity; CR5.13 – 20 Minute Mentor videos accessed; CR5.14 – 20 Minute Mentor user list). The usage and effectiveness of this series will be evaluated at the end of spring 2015.
- New Faculty Orientation for incoming faculty to the college is provided by the Professional Growth Committee and held every fall. New Faculty Orientation is one of the many ways that the college invests in the success of its faculty at all stages of their careers. The one day orientation will introduce new faculty to critical information, resources, and support during their tenure at the college. Additionally, these new faculty get an opportunity to network with other new faculty colleagues and gain additional
information. New faculty orientation this fall was held on October 3, 2014 (C5.15 – Faculty Orientation Agenda; C5.16 – Faculty Orientation Sign-in Sheets).

- The LACCD Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy, founded by the Student Success Initiative, is a joint effort between the LACCD and the LACCD Academic Senate to foster the highest standards of teaching and learning scholarship and to encourage the development of institutional cultures and environments that are learning-centered and technologically advanced. The college had five faculty members accepted into the 2014 FTLA Cohort and four faculty members accepted into 2015 FTLA Cohort (C5.17 – FTLA Cohort Rosters).

- The 2015 LASC Spring Flex Day on February 6, 2015, was devoted entirely to learning strategies for understanding and engaging under-resourced students. Professionals from Aha Process Inc. provided a hands-on workshop in which faculty, staff, and administrators learned teaching strategies to build cognitive ability, developed models to move students from concrete to abstract learning thinking and planning, and learned methods for building mutual trust and respect. This training was attended by ## faculty, staff and administrators (C5.18 – Spring Flex 2015 Sign-in sheets).

To ensure a continuous improvement of faculty knowledge of pedagogy appropriate to the College’s diverse student population, the College will continue to employ efforts that promote student success for all of its students.

Evidence

CR5.1 – March 15, 2014 ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
CR5.2 – July 3, 2014 ACCJC Action Letter
CR5.3 – Faculty Evaluations Sent to the District Office
CR5.4 – Article 19, Appendix C; Sample Improvement Plan
CR5.5 – 2014 LASC Faculty Academy Flyer
CR5.6 – 2013-2016 Professional Development plan
CR5.7 – Spring 2014 Professional Development Survey
CR5.8 – Spring 2014 Professional Development Survey results
CR5.9 – Great Teachers Seminar Flyer
CR 5.10 – Great Teachers Seminar sign-in list
CR5.11 – LASC Faculty Academy Spring 2014 Flyer
CR5.12 – 20 Minute Mentor Professional Opportunity
CR5.13 – 20 Minute Mentor videos accessed
CR5.14 – 20 Minute Mentor user list
CR5.15 – Faculty Orientation Agenda
CR5.16 – Faculty Orientation Sign-in Sheets
CR5.17 – FTLA Cohort Rosters

C5.18 – Spring Flex 2015 Sign-in sheets

**College Recommendation 6**
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College fully utilize the established consultative committee structure by documenting actions and recommendations in agendas, minutes, and other official tools to ensure that dialogues and decisions affecting the College are communicated widely and clearly across campus constituencies. (IVA.3)

This Recommendation was initially addressed in the College’s 2013 Follow-Up Report and subsequently in the College’s 2014 Follow-Up Report. Based on the 2014 Follow-Up Report, and the subsequent visit, the College received a Follow-up Visit Evaluation Report and Commission Action Letter, which stated that the College had addressed this Recommendation, had resolved the deficiencies, and now met the Standards cited in the Recommendation (CR6.1 – July 3, 2014 ACCJC Action Letter). The steps the College took to address this Recommendation are outlined below.

First, a standard format for reporting and documenting committee actions in agendas, minutes, and summary notes was developed (CR6.2 – Committee minutes common format). This format, which has been used consistently since July 1, 2012, allows for the recording of fundamental discussion points, dialogue, and decisions in a uniform manner across all committees. To further improve the clarity of committee minutes, all shared governance committee note takers attended a professional development workshop on December 10, 2013 to improve their note-taking skills (CR6.3 – December 10, 2013 Note-Taking Workshop PowerPoint Presentation).

Committee agendas, minutes, and supporting documents are then posted on each committee’s website. Prior to 2014, all committee documents were sent to either the Public Information Officer or the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for posting to committee websites. Depending on the workload of those offices, committee documents may not have been posted as quickly as some parties would have liked. To address this occasional bottleneck, the campus purchased and implemented the Microsoft SharePoint web system for its committee websites in fall 2014. This system allows committee chairs and their note takers to easily upload their own agendas, minutes, and other documents directly to their committee websites (CR6.4 – Screenshot of SPC webpage).
As a result, documents can be uploaded quickly after meetings without going through a multiple-step process. To ensure that this transition went smoothly, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness developed a detailed guide for committee chairs and note takers that describes how to upload their files (CR6.5 – Guide to Uploading Agendas and Minutes to SharePoint). The implementation of the SharePoint system will serve as a sustainable, long-term solution to furthering and improving campus-wide communication.

To publicize the decisions made in committee meetings, the Public Information Officer sends out regular notices to all college employees that summarizes action items from committee meetings. These notices include links to updated minutes on committee websites as well as highlights from the meeting minutes (CR6.6 – Sample PIO Committee Update Emails).

In further support of improving communication, a liaison model was developed by the Strategic Planning Committee in fall 2013 (CR6.7 – October 3, 2013 Strategic Planning Committee minutes). Under this model, each member of the Strategic Planning Committee regularly attends the meetings of at least one committee that reports to the Strategic Planning Committee. During each Strategic Planning Committee meeting, each liaison provides the committee with an update on the major items that were covered in the meeting(s) they attended. The Strategic Planning Committee is composed of a wide variety of representatives from all campus constituencies (CR6.8 – 2014-2015 Strategic Planning Committee membership). Thus, after each meeting, committee members have a comprehensive view of all college committee actions, recommendations, and attendance that they can communicate directly to all campus constituencies.

In addition, the College developed a College Committee Meeting Master Calendar to ensure that the entire campus community is aware of committee meeting days/times. This calendar is a single-page PDF file that is posted on the LASC website. It is formatted in a manner that makes it easy to print out and distribute to faculty and staff (CR6.9 – 2014-2015 College Committee Calendar).
Through the actions described above, the College has multiple official mechanisms in place to ensure that the decision-making processes on campus, as well as the decisions reached through these processes, are well communicated to all campus constituencies.

These actions have resulted in widespread dialogue about issues discussed in college committees. One example concerned a series of budget recommendations that were initially discussed at the November 5, 2013 meeting of the Budget Committee (CR6.10 - November 5, 2013 Budget Committee Minutes). In order to communicate these recommendations widely across campus, they were presented at the November 12, 2013 Academic Senate meeting (CR6.11 - November 12, 2013 Academic Senate Minutes). Next, all faculty, staff, and students were invited to hear and discuss the recommendations at a budget forum on November 19, 2013 (CR6.12 - President’s Email to Campus about Budget Forum 11-8-2013). After this forum, a link to an online survey was emailed to all campus employees, and was also placed on the LASC website (CR6.13 - President’s Email to Campus with Link to Budget Survey 11-19-2013). This survey asked employees if they supported the recommendations, and also allowed them to write in any comments they had. The survey results were then reviewed by the Budget Committee at a special meeting on November 26, 2013 (CR6.14 - Budget Recommendation Survey Results; CR6.15 - November 26, 2013 Budget Committee Minutes). Based in part on the survey results, the Budget Committee voted to approve the recommendations, which were then forwarded to the College Council for approval at its December 3, 2013 meeting (CR6.16 - December 3, 2013 College Council Minutes).

Evidence
CR6.2 – Committee minutes common format
Response to District Recommendations

District Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend that the District actively and regularly review the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the progress in the planned lifting of the moratorium to ensure the financial integrity of the bond programs, and the educational quality of its institutions as affected by the delays of the planned facilities projects (Standard III.B.1.a; III.D.2.a; IV.B.1.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

Status – RESOLVED

The ACCJC accepted the District’s activities in response to this recommendation on February 7, 2014, stating that “…LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2...” (DR1.1 – DACCJC letter, February 7, 2014).
District Actions Leading to Resolution

When this recommendation was received in July 2012, the District was already in the process of improving its bond oversight and the fiscal integrity of the program; however, the visiting team identified areas needing improvement for the District to fully meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements.

The District had already formed an Independent Review Panel in April 2011. The Panel issued a report on the District’s Building Program, which included 17 recommendations covering diverse areas including sustaining the M&O cost of new buildings, training on ethical considerations, creating an Executive Director of Facilities position, imposing a moratorium, modifying the college/district management structure, program costs and financial reporting, and handling of change orders (DR1.2 – Independent Review Panel Report, January 4, 2012).

The District submitted a Special Report on April 1, 2013, which described actions taken to address the Review Panel recommendations. Additional actions that the Chancellor and Board took included the creation of a Capital Construction Committee of the full Board to replace the three-member Infrastructure Committee; revision of reports to reflect more accurate college project budgets and forecasts; formation of a Board Ad Hoc Committee to consider additional policies related to oversight and control, and the creation of the Independent Office of Inspector General and Whistleblower Program (DR1.3 – District Special Report, April 1, 2013).

A two-person ACCJC evaluation team visited the District Office in May 2013 and issued a report in which the team concluded that “...Tremendous progress has been made on the review of the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the moratorium that is being lifted in phases based on the merit of each project...” (DR1.4 – ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2, 2013).

The ACCJC’s formal response, dated July 3, 2013, concurred with the progress and asked for it to be solidified in a follow-up report:

...the District had conducted a thorough review of the Bond Oversight Structure including the formation of an Independent Review Panel, the hiring of a new District Executive Director of Facilities Planning and Development, and an evaluation of the Total Cost of Ownership for facilities...however...the District is continuing to implement the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel and is considering additional Ad Hoc Committees policies to strengthen bond oversight and control. The Report should identify continuing actions that ensure the District’s oversight of this construction program (DR1.5 – ACCJC letter July 3, 2013).

The District responded in October 2013, noting progress made and actions taken to address the Independent Review Panel’s recommendations (DR1.6 – District Follow-Up Report, October 15, 2013).
1. The moratorium, which allowed the District to step back and conduct a thorough evaluation to determine whether certain criteria had been met, was concluded.

2. The District created Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that incorporate industry standards as benchmarks to allow assessment of effectiveness of the centralized model.

3. The Board funded the District’s bond program reserve. Subsequently, projects underwent risk analysis to determine the adequacy of the set-aside. Reports are reviewed to monitor and mitigate potential risk and training on risk management is provided.

4. The reconciliation process developed as a result of this recommendation was institutionalized, with meetings held monthly.

5. Outside Construction Counsel reviewed the 10 percent change order limit and concluded it was too restrictive. As a result, the Board planned to change the District’s change order policy to be consistent with other community colleges in the state.

6. A Board Resolution restructured the bond program management to a more centralized approach.

7. The District developed and implemented an energy program headed by AECOM (the new bond program manager), which assessed the return on investment (ROI) of past projects and the use of remaining funds, including Prop 39, for future energy-related projects.

8. The District began upgrades to the Student Information System (SIS), implementation of the CMMS (work and service order system), and the District physical one-card security system. The Board continues to receive regular reports on progress made to these technology initiatives.

9. A third delivery model, Lease-Leaseback, was introduced to allow “best value” selection, help minimize the number of change orders, and allow for contingencies during construction.

10. The District reviewed and updated existing procedures, revised where needed, and developed new ones for better oversight and control. New Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) were also established. The bond program management firm implemented Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) to improve outcomes related to quality, cost, and scheduling.

11. No further District action was required in the area of hard vs. soft costs.

12. The District received official acceptance of its methodology regarding compliance with Proposition 39 from the California State Attorney General.

13. The District restructured the District Citizens Oversight Committee (DCOC) to include a smaller group that utilizes industry experts, so it can ensure current industry standards are followed and the committee can function more effectively.

14. The District hired a new Facilities Executive Director (March 2012).

15. The Board hired a new program management firm, AECOM, a recognized industry leader in the field of project management. The District retained approximately one-third of the original program management staff to ensure a seamless transition.

16. The District conducted a study on long-term M&O needs and reviewed benchmarks related to industry standards.
Ethical compliance training is conducted annually. Additionally, in August 2013, the Board of Trustees created the Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMP&OC), which replaced the Capital Construction Committee (DR1.7 – Board Agenda, August 21, 2013, p. 59 & 61; DR1.8 – Board Minutes, August 21, 2013). This committee allows Trustees to more completely research and evaluate facilities-related decisions. The Whistleblower Program was also continued under the District’s Internal Audit Department, while the District released an RFP for a Bond Program Monitor (DR1.9 – RFP for Bond Program Monitor, September 16, 2013).

ACCJC Affirmation

Based on the District’s October follow-up report, the ACCJC responded in February 2014, verifying the resolution of Recommendation #1: “...The LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2 and met the associated Eligibility Requirements and Standards” (DR1.10 – ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014).

Ongoing Progress

The Board and the District have continued to implement the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel and additional Ad Hoc Committee policies to strengthen bond oversight and control.

Building Program Management Structure

The District has continued to refine its performance measures to ensure they incorporate industry standards and assess the effectiveness of its centralized model. The program manager has implemented Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that focus on quality, cost, and schedule. Monthly performance scores are evaluated and used to monitor the program’s progress as well as the performance indicators’ effectiveness in capturing the data and measuring the effectiveness of the building program (DR1.11 – LACCD CPM KPIs, May 31, 2014).

Program Reserve

Projects have continued to undergo risk analysis to determine the adequacy of the bond program reserves and set-aside for anticipated and unanticipated costs. Risk management reports on each project continue to be reviewed by District program management in order to monitor and mitigate potential risks (DR1.12 - Risk Overview Facilities Director’s Report, July 10, 2014).

Audit Update to Financial Reporting

The District CFO and the Program Management Office continue the reconciliation process by meeting together monthly.

Managing Change Orders

Despite outside counsel’s original assessment that the District’s 10 percent change order limit was too restrictive, further research showed that the District’s change order policy is consistent
with other community colleges in the state. Therefore, no revisions have been made to the District’s change order policy (DR1.13 – FMP&OC Minutes, April 30, 2014; DR1.14 – Change Order Memorandum June 16, 2014).

Energy Program

An energy program review and update was presented to the Board in August 2014 (DR1.15 – AECOM District wide Energy Program Overview, August 20, 2014).

Audit and Evaluate Design Management

Three delivery options for capital projects: 1) Design-Bid-Build; 2) Design-Build; and 3) Lease-Leaseback are being used for all three bond projects. The Lease-Leaseback option, added in 2013, minimizes the number of change orders and allows for contingencies during construction. The Board’s FMP&OC was presented with an update on the delivery options in June 2014 (DR1.16 – FMP&OC Agenda, June 25, 2014; DR1.17 – College Budget Recovery Plan presentation, June 17, 2014). The majority of the remaining projects will use the Lease-Leaseback method (DR1.18 – Board Agenda, p. 39, August 6, 2014; DR1.19 – Board Minutes, p. 5, August 6, 2014).

Better Control of Construction Management

The new Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that resulted from a review of existing procedures are now web-enabled and available 24/7 to project and program stakeholders (DR1.20 – Web Enabled SOPs, August 22, 2014). All parties who need to use the SOPs have received training. All the fields have been audited against the SOPs. AECOM has initiated internal quality audits of the entire bond program and has already conducted a full round of audits for all campuses.

Review and Revise the District Citizen’s Oversight Committee (DCOC)

The Board made changes to the DCOC’s membership to improve its functionality. (DR1.21 – Board Rule 17002 and 17004 Revisions, September 11, 2013). The restructured DCOC is a smaller group (reduced from 17 to 10) with a higher percentage of industry experts, four of whom have a strong construction background. During the past year, the Committee shifted its focus to construction project review and spends much of its time reviewing and discussing construction/bond projects and bond audits. As the two-year terms for Committee members cycle through, it will be easier to evaluate whether increasing the percentage of industry experts has had a positive impact on the Committee’s effectiveness.

Building Program Management

The contract of AECOM, the program management firm hired in spring 2013, specifies deliverables designed to continue and enhance effective and responsible oversight and operation of the bond program. AECOM presented an overview of the District’s implementation of green,
renewable and sustainable energy projects at the nine colleges and its role in energy stewardship (DR1.22 – AECOM District wide Energy Program Overview, August 20, 2014).

Impact of New Facilities on Long Term Operating Budgets

AECOM and Hickling and Associates LLC presented their findings and recommendations to the FMP&OC regarding the District’s custodial and building maintenance services. The presentation employed industry-based facilities performance indicators to compare the District’s services and needs with similar-sized educational institutions. Recommendations focused on developing a centralized custodial deployment strategy, including central training and cleaning inspection programs, as well as standardized equipment, supplies, and products. They also suggested a standard set of performance metrics for reporting costs, staffing density, and service levels (DR1.23 – AECOM Facilities Lifecycle Review, May 28, 2014). A follow-up report explained how this mandate would be accomplished (DR1.24 – Custodial Services Enhancement Program, July 23, 2014).

Ethical Considerations

Compliance training continues to be conducted annually for the staff. Three trainings were conducted in August 2014: Cost Principles Training, Program Labor Log Training, and The Color of Money (DR1.25 – Color of Money, Cost Principles and Program Labor Log Training Presentations, August 2014). Training on conflict of interest is also conducted with district and college building staff annually (DR1.26 – Conflict of Interest Training Presentation, July 2013).

On April 26, 2012, the Chancellor issued an interim directive mandating a conflict-of-interest checking process for the building program and directed the development of a comparable procedure for the District’s operational matters. The Conflict of Interest checklist is also requested from each member of the oversight committees on a biannual basis (DR1.27 – Chancellor Directive 152, April 26, 2012).

In 2012, the District automated its Form 700 process through the implementation of the E-Disclosure online portal. The District’s known designated filers are inputted and updated in the system. An annual filing notice is sent to all identified designated filers via e-mail in early March, approximately one month before the filing deadline of April 1st. The Office of General Counsel (OGC) also runs reports in E-Disclosure to determine which filers have not filed, and generates escalation messages accordingly. The Information Technology unit recently developed a link with the District’s payroll system to automate notifications when filers assume or leave office (DR1.28 – Form 700 Memo from Goulet, November 4, 2014).

To improve overall conflict of interest and Form 700 processes, the OGC has been meeting with other District administrators and building program staff (Form 700 Group) on a regular basis since 2012 and on a biweekly basis since fall 2013. The group’s work has focused in parallel on developing conflict-of-interest checking and on refining the e-filing and follow-up on Form 700s.
In winter 2014, the Contracts Unit implemented an updated flowchart, and a conflict-of-interest form comparable to the one in Chancellor’s Directive #152 has now been applied to all formal competitive processes (DR1.29 – Updated Conflict of Interest Flowchart, winter 2014). All contract ratifications pursuant to Procurement Policies and Procedures 04-05 through 04-08 include an affirmative step of checking for direct, financial conflicts of interest. In collaboration with the Form 700 Group, the OGC drafted a proposed Administrative Regulation, which will provide a narrative documentation of the procedure included in the attached flowchart. This Administrative Regulation has been circulated for final comments, and adoption is expected by the end of November 2014.

Conflict-of-interest training is included in the semi-annual Legal Crash Course presented for administrators, and it has been presented to the Educational Services Center Senior Staff. Supplemental stand-alone presentations have been made as requested by the colleges (DR1.30 – Legal Crash Course presentation, July 2013).

Additionally, all Trustees earned a certificate for completing a public service ethics training from June through October 2013 (DR1.31 – Board’s ethics training certificates, 2013).

Additional Actions

The Board’s Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMP&OC) continues to review and evaluate the colleges’ Facilities Master Plans (FMPs). They have reviewed FMPs for Harbor (August 21, 2013), West (November 20, 2013), East’s Firestone site (February 26, 2014), and Pierce (June 16, 2014) so far. The Committee will complete the review of the remaining five FMPs after appropriate internal review and planning (DR1.32 – FMP&OC Minutes, August 21, 2013; DR1.33 – FMP&OC Minutes, November 20, 2013; DR1.34 – FMP&OC Minutes, February 26, 2014; DR1.35 – FMP&OC Minutes, June 16, 2014).

Each college has developed a Strategic Execution Plan (SEP) for the final phase of its building programs. The plans align remaining projects to remaining funds, standardize contingencies, address project risks, and confirm bond compliance. Each college’s SEP established a baseline for all remaining facility construction work and included a prioritization list for each college’s remaining projects. All colleges developed and approved their respective SEPs between March 2014 and June 2014. The FMP&OC was presented with an update on the delivery options in June 2014 (DR1.36 – FMP&OC Minutes, June 25, 2014). A presentation made to the Bond Steering Committee in July 2014 illustrated the Strategic Execution Plan process, a summary of remaining work at each college, and next steps (DR1.37 – Bond Steering Committee Strategic Execution Plans Report, July 18, 2014).

Evidence

DR1.1 – DACCJC letter, February 7, 2014

DR1.3  – District Special Report, April 1, 2013
DR1.4  – ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2, 2013
DR1.5  – ACCJC letter July 3, 2013
DR1.6  – District Follow-Up Report, October 15, 2013
DR1.7  – Board Agenda, August 21, 2013, p. 59 & 61;
DR1.8  – Board Minutes, August 21, 2013
DR1.9  – RFP for Bond Program Monitor, September 16, 2013
DR1.10 – ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014
DR1.11 – LACCD CPM KPIs, May 31, 2014
DR1.12 – Risk Overview Facilities Director’s Report, July 10, 2014
DR1.13 – FMP&OC Minutes, April 30, 2014
DR1.14 – Change Order Memorandum June 16, 2014
DR1.15 – AECOM District wide Energy Program Overview, August 20, 2014
DR1.16 – FMP&OC Agenda, June 25, 2014
DR1.17 – College Budget Recovery Plan presentation, June 17, 2014
DR1.18 – Board Agenda, p. 39, August 6, 2014
DR1.19 – Board Minutes, p. 5, August 6, 2014
DR1.20 – Web Enabled SOPs, August 22, 2014
DR1.21 – Board Rule 17002 and 17004 Revisions, September 11, 2013
DR1.22 – AECOM District wide Energy Program Overview, August 20, 2014
DR1.23 – AECOM Facilities Lifecycle Review, May 28, 2014
DR1.24 – Custodial Services Enhancement Program, July 23, 2014
DR1.25 – Color of Money, Cost Principles and Program Labor Log Training Presentations, August 2014
DR1.26 – Conflict of Interest Training Presentation, July 2013
DR1.27 – Chancellor Directive 152, April 26, 2012
District Recommendation 2

In order to ensure the financial integrity of the District and the colleges, and to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend the resolution of the material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit be fully effected by the completion of next year’s audit, and appropriate systems be implemented and maintained to prevent future audit exceptions (Standards III.D.2.a; IV.B.1.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

Status – RESOLVED

The ACCJC accepted the District’s activities in response to this recommendation on February 7, 2014, stating that “…LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2…” (DR2.1 – ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014)

District Actions Leading to Resolution

The District began addressing this recommendation immediately after receiving it in July 2012 and formally reported on its progress in a report submitted in April 2013 (DR2.2 – District Special Report, April 1, 2013). The ACCJC team noted in its May 2013 evaluation report “Considerable progress has been made to resolve audit issues identified in the 2010 audit report...As a follow-up, the 2013 audit report should be reviewed as part of the normal financial review process to track the progress towards full implementation of all audit findings” (DR2.3 – ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2013).

Further progress was documented in the October 15, 2013 Follow-Up Report submitted to the ACCJC (DR2.4 – District Follow-up Report, October 2013). The ACCJC accepted the
District’s October 15, 2013 follow-up report at its January 2014 meeting, and this recommendation was considered resolved (DR2.5 – ACCJC letter, February 7, 2013). 

In order to address this recommendation, the District took the following actions:

**Capital Assets and General Obligation Bonds:**

1. **Policies and procedures to reconcile capital asset expenses in the proper period in accordance with GAAP**
   - Implemented additional controls and created a revised format and updated reconciliation procedure.


2. **Reconciling and reporting bond-funded furniture, fixtures, and equipment**
   - Completed three phases (Asset Management, Radio Frequency Identification, Inventory and Asset Tracking).


3. **Inadequate controls to reconcile possible conflicts of interest with vendor subcontractors**
   - Purchased software for E-filing Form 700 Conflict of Interest.


4. **Information Technology: Security and Change Management**
   - Implemented Mercury Quality Center and Security Weaver and removed Super User Access.
   - Moved SAP Basis and Security administrators to Security Weaver for management oversight and reporting.
   - Staffed a full-time Quality Assurance Analyst and implemented a new Self Service Password reset and SAP USER ID application.

Federal Findings:

1. Procedures were not in place to ensure proper monitoring of Financial Aid application verifications
   - Provided internal control procedures and quarterly reports to a quality assurance team.
     Fully implemented – expected to be confirmed in the 2013-14 Audit in December 2014.

2. Files for competitive grants for Worker Placement in High Growth and Emerging Industry Sectors were lost.
   - Deployed a series of document-saving protocols.

ACCJC Affirmation

Based on the District’s October follow-up report, the Commission responded in February 2014, verifying the resolution of Recommendation 2: “The LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2 and met the associated Eligibility Requirements and Standards” (DR2.10 – ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014).

Ongoing Progress

The 2012-13 Financial Audit (accepted at the December 11, 2013 Board meeting) verified that the District is in compliance on all the financial issues. Only one finding remains, an IT Security and Change Management recommendation that has been partially implemented (DR2.11 – 2012-13 Audit, p. 88, December 2013). Full implementation is expected to be confirmed in the 2013-14 Audit.

The District has made significant improvements over the past five years, reducing their financial audit findings from five to one, representing an 80% decrease. The District tracks its progress on implementing changes to address all audit findings as part of its ongoing procedures. When there is an audit finding, the District conducts staff training as part of its corrective action plan (DR2.12 – Financial Audit Training Participants, July 2013).

Evidence

DR2.1 – ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014
DR2.2 – District Special Report, April 1, 2013
DR2.3 – ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2013
DR2.4 – District Follow-up Report, October 2013
DR2.5 – ACCJC letter, February 7, 2013
District Recommendation 4
To fully respond to the recommendation first tendered by the Comprehensive Evaluation Team in 2006, and to reflect a realistic assessment of financial resources, financial stability, and the effectiveness of short- and long-term financial planning for the district and the colleges, and in order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend that the district adopt and fully implement as soon as is practicable an allocation model for its constituent colleges that addresses the size, economies of scale, and the stated mission of the individual colleges (IIID.1.b, IIID.1.c, IIID.2.c, IVB.3.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

District Actions Leading to Resolution
At the time of the last self-evaluation report and visit to the Seaside Colleges in March 2012, the District was finalizing a thorough review of its budget allocation model. The process had been underway since May 2011, when the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC) began analyzing the District’s budget allocation formula, base allocations, use of ending balance policy, assessments for District Educational Services Center operations, enrollment growth targets, and college deficit repayment policies. After much review and deliberation, the District Budget Committee (DBC) approved the new budget allocation model, which was adopted by the Board on June 13, 2012 (DR4.1 – Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, Com. BF4, June 13, 2012; DR4.2 – Board Minutes, Com. BF4, p. 6, June 13, 2012).

The resulting model amended the original allocation methods (modeled on SB 361), to one with minimum base funding for colleges. This new budget allocation model was phased in over a three-year period:

- Phase I increased the colleges’ basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and M&O costs based on square footage. The larger colleges (East LA College and Pierce College) have received less revenue, but their reductions were phased in over a three-year period. The smaller colleges benefitted by receiving more revenue in the first year. The new allocation model took into account both size and economy of scale when

- Phase II called for the ECDBC to study the remaining allocation agenda for potential allocation changes required to provide funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, ensure that colleges are provided with sufficient funding to achieve their missions, and maintain quality instruction and student services. Phase II components include the following:
  1. Growth Formula
  2. Review the current use of balance policy
  3. Assessments
  4. Productivity and Efficiency

The following are some of the activities completed by the District on Phase II:

Considered Alternative Growth Funding Proposals – In the time since the adoption of the new budget allocation model, the ECDBC has studied alternative growth funding formulas in response to Phase II. The Committee focused on considerations of population density, participation rate, and other factors in determining growth funding allocation. After studying various scenarios, the DBC approved recommending the following changes in spring 2013 to the Chancellor. These changes were also presented to the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee in September 2013.

- 80% of available growth funds shall be used to restore college workload reduction until the colleges are fully restored to their pre-reduction workloads.
- 10% of available growth funds shall be distributed to colleges based on each college’s share of the total LACCD underserved population.
- 10% of available growth funds shall be used to fund colleges based on the State model (DR4.6 – DBC Minutes, April 24, 2013; DR4.7 – DBC Memo to Chancellor, May 6, 2013; DR4.8 – Chancellor Memo to DBC, May 24, 2013; DR4.9 – Growth Funding Model Proposal Presentation to the BFC, August 21, 2013; DR4.10 – Budget and Finance Committee Meeting Minutes, September 11, 2013).

However, in early 2014, work on potential changes to the District’s current growth funding formula was suspended due to the new proposed growth funding formula in the Governor’s 2014-15 Education Budget Trailer Bill (DR4.11 – DBC Minutes, February 19, 2014; DBC Memo to Chancellor, February 26, 2014). With the completion and implementation of Phase I, changes to the base funding allocation have created a more equitable system for the smaller
colleges. The ongoing activities that are part of Phase II will include the ongoing evaluation and continued improvements to the District’s Growth Funding Formula.

The District had planned to review the new model after three years (at the end of the FY 2015) to see if the formula is working to address the needs of the smaller colleges. The DBC has already begun conducting an evaluation and is expected to complete it by the end of fall 2014 (DR4.12 – DBC Agenda, August 13, 2014).

Approved a Balance and Reserve Policy -- On September 5, 2012, the DBC approved changes to the District Balance and Reserve policy as recommended by the ECDBC (DR4.13 – DBC Memo to Chancellor, September 10, 2012). The Chancellor received and approved the recommendation to maintain the general reserve at 5% and the contingency reserve at 5%; allow colleges to keep their year-end balances up to 5% of their prior fiscal year’s unrestricted general fund budget (excluding prior year balances); and allow colleges to carry over their accumulated balances up to 10% of their prior year’s unrestricted general fund budget (DR4.14 – Chancellor Memo to DBC, September 26, 2012).

On August 21, 2013, the DBC requested that the Board of Trustees increase the general reserve level to 6.5% and reduce the contingency reserve to 3.5% of unrestricted general revenue for fiscal year 2013-14. The Board of Trustees adopted the 2013-14 Final Budget with these changes. The adjustment to these reserves was based on recent increases and decreases for these respective reserve funds. The combined total for both reserve funds remained at 10% of the overall budget (DR4.15 – 2013-14 Final Budget, August 21, 2013; DR4.16 – Budget and Finance Committee Minutes, August 21, 2013).

Amended College Debt Repayment Policy – The DBC recommended that the District amend the College Debt Repayment Policy to do the following (DR4.17 – DBC Minutes August 14, 2013):

- Limit the annual college debt repayment obligation to 3% of the college’s final budget allocation.
- Create a policy for giving colleges a method of receiving debt relief upon fulfilling certain conditions.
- Suspend debt repayment for one year when a college has a new or interim president to allow him/her time to plan and address the college’s fiscal issues.


Passed new District Financial Accountability Measures to increase Productivity and Efficiency – These measures ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of colleges within the District. These measures included operating standards, measurement criteria, and consequences/actions for colleges that end their
fiscal year in deficit (DR4.21 – District Financial Accountability Measures-Revision#1, September 19, 2013; DR4.22 – Board Meeting Agenda, BF2, October 9, 2013; DR4.23 – Board Meeting Minutes, October, 9, 2013).

The District, along with the Board of Trustees, continues to review the fiscal health of the District and its nine colleges. In August 2014, the Budget and Finance Committee reviewed the proposed Final Budget for 2014-15 with the Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer. This budget included some of the recommendations from Phase II (DR4.24 – Notice of 2014-15 Final Budget, August 6, 2014; DR4.25 – Budget & Finance Committee Meeting Minutes, August 6, 2014).

The District continues to make significant strides towards improving its financial growth formula, balance policies and practices, assessment of financial resources, and college debt policies and practices to ensure colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services.

Evidence

DR4.1 – Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, Com. BF4, June 13, 2012
DR4.2 – Board Minutes, Com. BF4, p. 6, June 13, 2012
DR4.4 – Notice of 2014-15 Final Budget, p. 1-10, August 6, 2014
DR4.5 – Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, Com BF4, p. 5, June 13, 2012
DR4.6 – DBC Minutes, April 24, 2013
DR4.7 – DBC Memo to Chancellor, May 6, 2013
DR4.8 – Chancellor Memo to DBC, May 24, 2013
DR4.9 – Growth Funding Model Proposal Presentation to the BFC, August 21, 2013
DR4.10 – Budget and Finance Committee Meeting Minutes, September 11, 2013
DR4.11 – DBC Minutes, February 19, 2014; DBC Memo to Chancellor, February 26, 2014
DR4.12 – DBC Agenda, August 13, 2014
DR4.13 – DBC Memo to Chancellor, September 10, 2012
DR4.14 – Chancellor Memo to DBC, September 26, 2012
DR4.15 – 2013-14 Final Budget, August 21, 2013
District Recommendation 5
To meet the Standard, the Teams recommend that the Board of Trustees make visible, in behavior and in decision-making, their policy role and their responsibility to act as a whole in the public’s interest. Further, the Teams recommend continuing professional development for the Board of Trustees to ensure a fuller understanding of its role in policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the Chancellor or his designee (IVB.1.a).

District Actions Leading to Resolution
In 2012, the District implemented a comprehensive Board development program. Training was held in February, April, and November of 2012. Topics included helping Board members distinguish their responsibilities from those of the Chancellor, understand their roles in setting policy, and develop goals and objectives (DR5.1 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, February, 21, 2012; DR5.2 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, April 19, 2012; DR5.3 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, November 13, 2012).

To institutionalize its commitment to the principles conveyed at its retreats and trainings, the Board revised Board Rule 2300.10 (Code of Ethical Conduct) to include the following language:

“I recognize that the Chancellor is the Trustees’ sole employee; I pledge to work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record.” In addition, the revised language affirms the Trustees’ pledge to avoid involvement in operational matters:
I will participate in the development of policy and the approval of strategy for the District and respect the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institution. I will avoid involvement in day-to-day operations.

Furthermore, the Board Rule states:

As a Trustee, I will treat others with respect, even in disagreement, and do my best to earn the respect of others. Being respectful requires civility and courtesy, as well as tolerance for legitimate differences and a willingness to acknowledge that reasonable people can respectfully hold divergent views (DR5.4 – Board Rule 2300.10 revisions, January 30, 2013).

As part of the District’s commitment to support and document the use of official channels of communication between the Board and staff, District staff reviewed operational procedures and re-activated the use of an internal document tracking form for information requests from Board members. When a Board member requests further information on an issue before, during, or after a meeting, the Assistant Secretary to the Board sends a memo titled “Board Follow-up Items” to the Deputy Chancellor. The Deputy Chancellor then enters it on a form (Response to Board Member Inquiry) and adds it to a tracking document. Responses to inquiries of this nature are sent to the Board as part of a larger package of materials sent every two weeks in the Board packet.

During a Board meeting, as the Board considers matters contained on the Consent Calendar, those items for which Board members require clarification or further information are set aside. The Board President will ask for a vote on the remaining items and then recognize those Board members who require additional information. Once questions have been answered, the Board President will proceed with a vote on each of the items pulled from the Consent Calendar. However, any items requiring further information will be tabled until the information can be provided to the Board members so they can discuss the issue knowledgeably prior to a vote. Decisions made by the Board are based on full and open discussion of the issues.

In January 2013, the Board also revised Board Rule 2105 to encourage further training: “Within budgetary limits, Trustees shall be encouraged to attend conferences and other educational sessions regarding their responsibilities as Trustees” (DR5.5 – BR 2105 revision, January 16, 2013). Additionally, the Board of Trustees completed ethics training from June through October 2013 (DR5.6 – Board’s ethics training certificates, 2013).

The Board held a special meeting to discuss an Action Plan for Board Development. This meeting included a presentation on relevant accreditation standards and board policies conducted by Dr. Jerome Hunter of CSU Fullerton and the Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership and a discussion of the Board’s self-evaluation summary report (DR5.7 – Board of Trustees Evaluation: Comparison Report 2012-2013, February 2013; DR5.8 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, March 19, 2013). To guide its future course of action, the Board
developed an actionable improvement plan at its annual retreat in spring 2013 (DR5.9 – Board Actionable Improvement Plan, March 19, 2013).

The Board followed a different process in 2013-14 for its evaluation than in previous years. In October 2013, ACCJC Associate Vice President Dr. John Nixon facilitated a goal-setting workshop to assist the trustees in setting their 2013-14 goals (DR5.10 – Board Goals 2013-14, October 22, 2013). He also reviewed Board roles and responsibilities (DR5.11 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, October 22, 2013; DR5.12 – Accreditation and Trustee Presentation, October 22, 2013).

In March 2014, the Board reviewed its goals and discussed achievements during an annual self-assessment session facilitated by external educational consultants Dr. Jose Leyba and Thomas Brown (DR5.13 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, March 13, 2014). As a follow-up to that session, these consultants met with each trustee individually to flesh out the Board’s collective goals as part of the Board’s self-assessment. Trustees’ comments and concerns were compiled, reported in public session, and provided to the incoming Chancellor to ensure continued positive momentum (DR5.14 – Board Self-Evaluation, May 28, 2014).

On August 23, 2014, the Board and Chancellor met during a special meeting to discuss the Board’s goals, its committee goals, Board protocols, and the Chancellor’s vision and goals (DR5.15 – Board Retreat Handouts, August 23, 2014; DR5.16 – Board Special Meeting Agenda, August 23, 2014). The Board conducted a self-assessment of its progress in meeting the goals set in Dr. Nixon’s October 2013 workshop (DR5.17 – Report of Board Goal Statements 2013-2014, August 28, 2014).

Evidence

DR5.1 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, February, 21, 2012
DR5.2 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, April 19, 2012
DR5.3 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, November 13, 2012
DR5.4 – Board Rule 2300.10 revisions, January 30, 2013
DR5.5 – BR 2105 revision, January 16, 2013
DR5.6 – Board’s ethics training certificates, 2013
DR5.7 – Board of Trustees Evaluation: Comparison Report 2012-2013, February 2013
DR5.8 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, March 19, 2013
DR5.9 – Board Actionable Improvement Plan, March 19, 2013
DR5.10 – Board Goals 2013-14, October 22, 2013
DR5.11 – Board Special Meeting Minutes, October 22, 2013
Response to Self-Identified issues in the Planning Agenda

Planning Agenda Item 1
Evaluate and update all institutional plans in line with the new LASC 2011-2014 Strategic Plan.

Standard I.B.6. - The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Response

LASC has a fully integrated planning and resource allocation model (PA1.1 - Diagram of Planning and Resource Allocation Model). The LASC Strategic Plan is the College’s overarching planning document, and includes the College’s Mission, Vision, and Strategic Goals (PA1.2 - LASC 2014-2020 Strategic Plan). Beginning in fall 2013, the previous strategic plan was evaluated and revised. At an annual campus-wide retreat on November 15, 2013, faculty, staff, and administrators assessed the progress made on the Strategic Plan and evaluated its overall effectiveness (PA1.3 - 2013 Annual Planning Retreat Attendance). It was noted to have a number of shortcomings, the most notable of which being the difficulty in measuring a number of indicators of progress towards Strategic Goals.

After this initial evaluation, a taskforce was created to fully evaluate and develop a draft 2014-2020 LASC Strategic Plan. This taskforce included administrators, classified staff, and faculty members. The taskforce evaluated the previous plan, and also examined the State and District Strategic Plans, the Strategic Plans from 18 other California Community Colleges, an extensive amount of College data, and the recent California and Federal College Scorecards. Using all of these sources, the taskforce developed a draft plan. This plan was presented to the entire campus community to gain feedback. After feedback was obtained and incorporated in the draft, the plan was approved at the Academic Senate (PA1.4 - April 22, 2014 Academic Senate minutes), the College Council (PA1.5 - May 5, 2014 College Council minutes), and by the College President (PA1.6 - College President Approval of Strategic Plan).
To ensure alignment of campus operational plans (i.e. Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and Technology Master Plan) with the new Strategic Plan, the final evaluation and updating of campus operational plans began in earnest after the Strategic Plan was updated. This was done for two reasons. First, a number of campus constituencies had noted that operational plans were not evaluated as systematically as the Strategic Plan. Second, the timelines of the plans were not in sync with each other. Once the Strategic Plan was revised, it set a clear direction for both the timeline and evaluation of campus operational plans. This resulted in an improved alignment of all campus plans. Further, it ensured that all plans were to be regularly evaluated in a systematic manner.

The 2014 campus-wide annual planning retreat held on August 26, 2014, was devoted almost entirely to this effort. In addition to the typical invitees (e.g. Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty, etc.), special efforts were made to invite the members of the Educational Master Plan Committee, the Facilities Planning Committee, and the Technology Committee. During the retreat, attendees reviewed the 2014-2020 LASC Strategic Plan, examined strategic plan data, began evaluating the previous campus operational plans, and also examined recent operational plans from other community colleges (PA1.7 – 2014 Planning Retreat Agenda and Exercises). In addition, a timeline for the completion of the plans was distributed (PA1.8 – Campus Operational Plan Completion Timeline) and agreed upon. This timeline included monthly progress updates to the Strategic Planning Committee and a presentation/discussion of the plans at the October 24th, 2014 Accreditation kickoff. A spring planning retreat was held on February 27, 2015, in which attendees continued working on the plans, and ensured that there was full integration among the three of them (PA1.9 – Spring 2015 Planning Retreat Agenda). It is anticipated that all three campus master plans will be completed in spring 2015.

Evidence

PA1.1. – Diagram of Planning and Resource Allocation Model
PA1.2 – 2014-2020 LASC Strategic Plan
PA1.3. – 2013 Planning Retreat Attendance
PA1.4 – April 22, 2014 Academic Senate minutes
PA1.5 – May 5, 2014 College Council minutes
PA1.6 – College President Approval of Strategic Plan
PA1.7 – 2014 Planning Retreat Agenda and Exercises
PA1.8 – Campus Operational Plan Completion Timeline
PA1.9 – Spring 2015 Planning Retreat Agenda
Planning Agenda Item 2
Implement the Distance Education Policy adopted in fall 2011.

Standard II.A.1.b – The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of students.

Standard II.A.2.d – The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of students.

Response
The LASC Distance Education Policy was implemented in spring 2012. The Distance Education Learning Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures Manual was approved by the LASC Academic Senate on February 14, 2012 (PA2.1 – February 14, 2012 Academic Senate minutes). This manual outlines both the College and District Guidelines for Distance Education courses. It is a valuable resource for all faculty who are teaching distance education courses. It clearly explains the college policy regarding student absences, student complaints, and instructor absences in Distance Education courses. Further, it includes information on effective pedagogical practices and how to create a positive learning environment in Distance Education courses. It also includes the ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education (PA2.2 – Distance Learning Guidelines, Policies and Procedures Manual). The manual is reviewed by the Distance Education Committee annually, and is updated when necessary. This manual is available to the entire campus community on the LASC Distance Education Committee website (PA2.3 – Screenshot of Distance Education Committee Website).

Evidence
PA2.1 – February 14, 2012 Academic Senate minutes
PA2.2 – Distance Learning Guidelines, Policies and Procedures Manual
PA2.3 – Screenshot of Distance Education Committee Website
Planning Agenda Item 3
Implement and monitor the six semester SLO cycle to reach sustainability by 2014.

Standard II.A.1.c – The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

Standard II.A.2.b – The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress toward achieving those outcomes.

In appendix table but not in actual report in this section

Response
The LASC six semester course assessment cycle was passed unanimously at the September 4, 2010 Academic Senate meeting (PA3.1 – September 14, 2010 Academic Senate minutes). This cycle clearly documents when SLO’s should be assessed, when improvement plans should be developed, when improvement plans should be implemented, and when SLO’s should be reassessed (PA3.2 – LASC six semester SLO cycle). This cycle was first implemented in fall 2010 and is still the model for SLO assessment at the College.

In spring 2013, LASC’s SLO Coordinator, Glenn Yoshida, retired. Professor Yoshida was an extremely knowledgeable and motivated faculty member who was well-liked and respected by the entire campus community. He had been leading the SLO charge at LASC for a number of years, and was largely responsible for the SLO Commendation that LASC received in 2012. Finding a successor who possessed all of Professor Yoshida’s unique qualities proved to be a challenge. During the transition period between Professor Yoshida’s retirement, and the appointment of the current SLO coordinator, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness oversaw the SLO assessment timeline for fall 2013 and spring 2014. In that capacity, he generated a list of courses that were to be assessed in fall 2013 and spring 2014, and distributed this list to each department. He then monitored adherence to the timeline, received SLO assessment matrices for the identified courses, and posted them to the SLO Committee website. In spring 2014, a new faculty SLO Coordinator was appointed, who worked closely with Student Services and Administrative Services. In addition, the SLO Committee worked to implement procedures to ensure that the College adhered to the six semester cycle (PA3.3 – October 27, 2014 SLO Committee minutes). In spring 2015, the SLO Committee will evaluate this timeline to determine if it still meets the needs of the College, or if modifications are necessary.

The College SLO Committee is also actively investigating software packages that will make it easier to monitor where SLO’s are in the six semester cycle. Currently, SLO’s are entered into Microsoft Word documents and uploaded to the SLO Committee website. While this method allows for all SLO’s to be easily accessible by the campus, it has its limitations with regard to tracking changes over time. The College recently moved its program review and planning...
process to an online system using SharePoint. An analysis is underway to determine if the SLO process can also be migrated to the online SharePoint system. If this is not possible, the College will examine other software packages (e.g. TracDat, eLumen, Curricunet, etc.) as alternative solutions.

Evidence

PA3.1 – September 4, 2010 Academic Senate minutes

PA3.2 – LASC Six Semester SLO Cycle

PA3.3 – SLO Committee minutes from fall 2014

**Planning Agenda Item 4**
Incorporate assessment of online student services into non-instructional program review process

Standard II.B.1. – The Institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution

One of the primary ways in which student services ensures the quality of its support services and ensures that student needs are being met, is through the annual comprehensive non-instructional program review process.

Response

The non-instructional program review form was revised during the spring 2013 semester by the LASC Program Review Committee (PA8.1 – March 13, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes, PA8.2 – April 29, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes, PA8.3 – May 8, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes). A specific focus of this revision was to make it more consistent with the instructional program review, to create a stronger link between program objectives and budget requests, and to integrate student survey data more consistently and formally. In addition, it required programs to respond to questions related to student demand for online services.

Evidence

PA8.1 – March 13, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes

PA8.2 – April 29, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes

PA8.3 – May 8, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes

**Planning Agenda Item 5**
Provide human and physical resources to support the library’s mission
Standard II.C.1.b. - The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.

Response

This planning agenda item mirrors College Recommendation 4. For a full description of the steps taken, please see the College Recommendation 4 response above.

Planning Agenda Item 6
Establish the Human Resources Committee as per the Planning Handbook

Standard III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

Response

In the time since this Planning Agenda Item was developed, the functions of the Human Resource Committee have been absorbed into the Educational Master Plan Committee. In the November 5, 2012 meeting of the College Council, it was noted that there was overlap among committee charges and that by combining some committee functions, as well as committees themselves, participation, effectiveness and efficiency would improve (PA6.1 – November 5, 2012 College Council minutes). To this end, the Strategic Planning Committee performed an assessment to determine where these overlaps existed in its December 6, 2012 meeting (PA6.2 – December 6, 2012 SPC minutes). This assessment was framed by the 2012-2013 LASC Functional Map document (PA6.3 - LASC Functional Map), and resulted in approved SPC recommendations to restructure, combine, and eliminate specific campus committees (PA6.2 - December 6, 2012 SPC minutes). These recommendations were approved by the Academic Senate (PA6.4 - March 12, 2013 Academic Senate minutes) and the College Council (PA6.5 - April 8, 2013 College Council minutes) in the spring of 2013. Through this process, the Human Resources Committee was absorbed into the Educational Master Planning Committee.

Evidence

PA6.1 – November 5, 2012 College Council minutes

PA6.2 – December 6, 2012 SPC minutes

PA6.3 – LASC Functional Map

PA6.4 – March 12, 2013 Academic Senate minutes

PA6.5 – April 8, 2013 College Council minutes
Planning Agenda Item 7
Hire M&O staff sufficient to bring the college to a level that will effectively serve the campus needs.

Standard III.B.2. – To insure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

Response

In October 2011, LACCD placed a temporary moratorium on 67 projects that had not started or were already on hold per recommendations by the State Chancellor’s Office, Building Program Review Panel and other audit reports. The temporary moratorium was intended to provide time to analyze the effect of the State budget cuts on the Colleges’ ability to fund maintenance and operation of facilities upon completion of the District’s Building Program (PA7.1 – 2013 LACCD Comprehensive Plan for total cost of ownership).

As noted in the 2013 LACCD Comprehensive Plan for total cost of ownership, the results of the initial moratorium analysis identified shortfalls in operating (non-bond) budgets as well as capital improvement (bond) budgets. One of the three major areas of concern was the M&O (non-bond) Budget, as the State budget cuts had resulted in significant potential shortfalls of operating budget (non-bond) funds for facility M&O at completion of the building programs at the nine Colleges.

Based on the data provided in the 2013 LACCD Comprehensive Plan for total cost of ownership, along with several workshops conducted with each College, the M&O cost increase for all projects released or exempt from the moratorium is estimated to be $2.0 million per year in fiscal year 2012 – 2013 growing to $4.0 million in fiscal year 2015 – 2016 (PA7.1 – 2013 LACCD Comprehensive Plan for total cost of ownership).

The total cost increase of all projects was estimated to be $2.01 million per year in fiscal year 2012 – 2013 growing to $7.4 million in fiscal year 2015 – 2016. The forecasted increase in M&O costs for each college by fiscal year is illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FY10/11 Expenditures</th>
<th>FY12/11</th>
<th>FY13/14</th>
<th>FY14/15</th>
<th>FY15/16</th>
<th>Added M&amp;O Costs from Projects Released/Exempt from Moratorium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$7,079,171</td>
<td>$108,163</td>
<td>$375,063</td>
<td>$643,663</td>
<td>$643,663</td>
<td>$160,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>$11,320,529</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$134,276</td>
<td>$209,431</td>
<td>$209,431</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>$3,829,454</td>
<td>$125,215</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$211,689</td>
<td>$211,689</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>$3,489,903</td>
<td>$352,158</td>
<td>$392,158</td>
<td>$956,849</td>
<td>$956,669</td>
<td>$4,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>$7,268,562</td>
<td>$775,547</td>
<td>$777,866</td>
<td>$831,407</td>
<td>$1,234,620</td>
<td>$1,039,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>$3,744,118</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$268,207</td>
<td>$268,207</td>
<td>$268,207</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>$6,463,570</td>
<td>$365,898</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$397,525</td>
<td>$397,525</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>$6,641,643</td>
<td>$159,520</td>
<td>$364,606</td>
<td>$421,203</td>
<td>$421,203</td>
<td>$161,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>$4,125,026</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$53,953,872</td>
<td>$2,017,801</td>
<td>$2,494,726</td>
<td>$3,364,049</td>
<td>$4,073,307</td>
<td>$2,755,954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| City    | 3.7%                  | 4.6%    | 6.2%    | 7.5%    | 5.3%    | 9.0%                                                   |
| East    | 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| Harbor  | 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| Mission | 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| Pierce  | 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| Southwest| 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| Trade   | 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| Valley  | 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| West    | 0.0%                  | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%    | 0.0%                                                   |
| Total   | 3.7%                  | 4.6%    | 6.2%    | 7.5%    | 5.3%    | 9.0%                                                   |
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In an effort to address the increased need for M&O at Los Angeles Southwest College, based on the new and remodeled buildings, the college has hired additional custodians.

Evidence

PA7.1 – 2013 LACCD Comprehensive Plan for total cost of ownership

Planning Agenda Item 8
Pilot and implement the LACCD IES for online program review and planning.

Standard III.D.1.a. – Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning

Standard III.D.2. – To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

Response

When the 2012 Self-Evaluation was written, the college was actively participating in the development of a district-wide online program review and planning system which was known as the Institutional Effectiveness System (IES). After an extensive period of development and testing, it became clear that the IES system would not meet the needs of the campus. LASC was not alone in this assessment; only one of the nine colleges in the district decided to implement the IES system.

Although the IES system did not meet the needs of LASC, the need for an online program review and planning system remained. To address this need, LASC purchased the Microsoft SharePoint system in Summer 2014. This system addressed a number of additional campus needs, including those related to improving the communication of committee decisions. This online system improved the program review process in a number of ways. The most evident of these was the improved transparency of the entire process. Previously, program reviews were completed in Microsoft Word documents, and were emailed between faculty initiators, department chairs, deans, and vice presidents. This led to a fairly closed system which made it difficult to track programs’ progress towards program review completion. The new online system allows anyone to view the status of every program review at any time. In addition, because all program reviews are publicly available on the college website, faculty and staff who are completing their program reviews can view those from other programs. This allows them to see how other programs in different areas answered the same questions, which can spur the generation of new and innovative ideas, and the development of best practices. This increased transparency may have also led to some “peer pressure” for programs to complete their program reviews in a timely manner. Some anecdotal evidence suggests that faculty were motivated to complete their program review quickly so that they wouldn’t appear to be lagging behind their peers.

The program review form itself was also revised during the spring 2013 semester by the LASC Program Review Committee (PA8.1 – March 13, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes,
PA8.2 – April 29, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes, PA8.3 – May 8, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes). The committee spent multiple meetings evaluating the form and the entire program review process. As a result of this evaluation, a number of changes were made. Redundancies and irrelevant portions of the program review were removed. Further, special attention was paid to creating a stronger link between program planning objectives and resource allocation requests.

This resulted in a revised program review form that directly aligned college strategic goals, program objectives, and resource allocation requests. This form was approved by the Academic Senate on May 13, 2014 (PA8.4 – May 13, 2014 Academic Senate minutes).

A specific focus of this revision was to provide more clarity on the budget planning process. In previous years, budget allocation requests had an element of inconsistency to them, which manifested itself when the Budget Committee began prioritizing the requests. The Budget Committee often had to request additional information from both the programs and the LASC Budget Office before they were able to accurately prioritize the requests. By the end of this prioritization, all of the information was completely accurate, but the process took much longer than necessary. To address this issue, the budget allocation request portion of the form was completely revised to be much clearer. The form now includes embedded hyperlinks to the District Personnel Commission website to allow programs to determine the specific job title and monthly salary of each staff position they are requesting. Further, the form automatically calculates the total costs (including both salary and benefits) of faculty, classified staff, and unclassified staff requests. It also requires programs to identify the source of the funds, and whether the funds will be one-time or ongoing. This revision, combined with the advantages of an online system, will also allow the college to better categorize and understand the type of requests that are being made each year through the program review process. As a result, it will serve as a needs assessment in the areas of technology and facilities. This assessment will be sent to the Facilities Planning Committee and the Technology Committee, so that they can ensure that the College’s needs are being met.

In fall 2014, all of these revisions were implemented for the first time; the revised form was completed by all programs through the new online SharePoint system. To ensure that these changes were implemented smoothly, they were presented in multiple forums on campus. System demonstrations were done at the August 26, 2014 annual planning retreat (PA8.5 – 2014 Planning Retreat Agenda), the Academic Senate (PA8.6 – September 9, 2014 Academic Senate minutes), the Fall 2014 Department Chairs retreat (PA8.7 – Department Chairs Retreat agenda/minutes), the August 20, 2014 Academic Deans meeting (PA8.8 – Academic Deans agenda/minutes), the August 14, 2014 Program Review Committee meeting (PA8.9 – August 14, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes), the September 30, 2014 Student Services Managers meeting (PA8.10 – September 30, 2014, Student Services Managers Meeting Email), and the October 6, 2014 Administrative Services Managers meeting (PA8.11 – October 6, 2014 Administrative Services Managers Meeting Email). Detailed guides were developed for instructional, student service, and administrative service programs (PA8.12 –
Instructional Program Review Guide, PA8.13 – Student Services Non-Instructional Program Review Guide, PA8.14 – Administrative Services Non-Instructional Program Review Guide. In addition, a step-by-step YouTube video was created (PA8.15 – Program Review YouTube Screenshot) to walk participants through the process. Both the guides and the video were made publicly available on the Program Review Committee website (PA8.16 – Screenshot of Program Review Committee webpage). In addition, three drop-in help sessions were held in campus computer labs. One session was held in the morning, another in the afternoon, and the third in the evening, in order to provide training to faculty and staff with varying work schedules.

During the spring 2015 semester, the Program Review Committee will assess and evaluate the revised process to determine which aspects worked and which ones need further refinement. This evaluation will ensure that the college’s program review and planning process will continue to drive the college’s financial plans.

Evidence

PA8.1 – March 13, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes
PA8.2 – April 29, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes
PA8.3 – May 8, 2014 Program Review Committee minutes
PA8.4 – May 13, 2014 Academic Senate minutes
PA8.5 – 2014 Planning Retreat Agenda
PA8.6 – September 9, 2014 Academic Senate minutes
Planning Agenda Item 9
Integrate total cost of ownership (TCO) cost in annual budget process.

Standard III.D.1.c – When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long range financial priorities to assure financial stability the institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Response
After much review and deliberation, the District Budget Committee (DBC) approved a new budget allocation model, which was adopted by the Board on June 13, 2012 (PA9.1 – Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, Com. BF4, June 13, 2012; PA9.2 – Board Minutes, Com. BF4, p. 6, June 13, 2012).

In July 2012, the District implemented the amended Budget Allocation Mechanism to ensure that each College receives an annual base allocation to fully fund minimum administrative staffing and M&O costs based on an average cost per gross square footage.

The average cost will be updated annually based on prior year expenditures and District gross square feet. As a result, Los Angeles Southwest College (along with five other colleges in the LACCD) saw an increase in M&O funds in fiscal year 2012–2013 (PA9.3 – 2013 LACCD Comprehensive Plan for total cost of ownership).

Evidence

PA9.2. – Board Minutes, Com. BF4, p. 6, June 13, 2012
Planning Agenda Item 10
Develop a strategic communication plan inclusive of web access, social networking, and alert systems.

Standard IV.A.2 – The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies - In appendix table but not in actual report in this section

Standard IV.A.2.a – Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms for providing input into institutional decisions.

Response
The purpose of this planning agenda item was to improve the communication of decision making processes on campus, as well as the decisions reached through these processes. This planning agenda item mirrors College Recommendation 6. For a full description of the steps taken, please see the College Recommendation 6 response above.

Update on Substantive Changes in Progress, Pending, or Planned
The college will be submitting a substantive change for the Computer Applications program and the Political Science Program in the spring of 2015.