Executive Summary of Self Evaluation  
IESS Committee Accreditation Visit, Los Angeles City College, November 6, 2015

**Process.** The Self Evaluation was a collaborative effort, with significant effort from over 40 campus leaders including faculty, staff, and administration (Section III). Feedback was solicited from all constituencies at numerous workshops and days of dialogue. The Self Evaluation resulted in 25 action plans to be addressed through existing processes, and 17 action plans to be addressed through the action projects described in the quality focus essay.

**Primary outcomes.** The College’s new Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook allowed for a refinement of the existing integrated planning cycle; this key document now guides the College towards continuous quality improvement and ensures transparency by helping all employees understand College processes. The Self Evaluation reveals that the revised process allows for an accurate assessment of whether the College is meeting its mission (Standard I.A.3), is based on realistic expectations for student achievement (I.B.3), is data-driven (I.B.4), is communicated to and understood by all constituencies (I.B.8), and has resulted in meaningful improvements to programs and services (I.B.9).

The College improved its ability to assess its Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) through the development of supporting plans (Human Resources, Technology, Staff Development, Distance Education), annual data review in oversight committees, and by requiring unit planning objectives to support ESMP measures (Standard I.B.9). The defining of institution set standards in FTES, course completion; persistence; progression; program, degree, and certificate completion; transfer; licensure/certification exam results; and job placement was the result of a multi-year analysis of data through College level and program review (Section II.B). All institution-set standards are components of the 2014-20 ESMP. The expanded use of SharePoint allows for improved documentation of processes, practices, and outcomes, resulting in improved institutional effectiveness.

**Improvement Planning.** Standards analyses resulted in one of three possible outcomes: proof of meeting the standard, action plans that can be implemented using existing College processes, or quality focus plans that necessitate long-term planning. The quality focus essay plans resulted in two action projects: (a) improving enrollment management through a marketing, recruiting, and retention plan; and (b) decreasing the average time it takes students to complete awards (Section VIII). The projects will focus College resources on actions the College believes will positively impact student achievement, student learning, and realization of the institutional mission. The projects will be assessed using the established integrated planning process.

**Completing the Self Evaluation.** To complete the Self Evaluation the College needs to upload its evidence to SharePoint and insert active hyperlinks into the document. The document requires further editing to eliminate redundancy and reduce the number of words. By mid-November the Self Evaluation will be vetted by the Academic Senate and College Council.
LACC Accreditation Self Evaluation
Highlights for the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee

November 6, 2015

A. Analysis of Standards I-IV
B. Quality Focus Essay
C. Final Statement: Continuous Quality Improvement
Standard I

Major outcomes

- Wrote a new Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook (I.A.4, I.B.5)
- Increased assessment of data in Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) oversight committees (I.A.4, I.B.5)
- Refined program review; expanded use of SharePoint for tracking unit planning objectives, resources (I.B.1)
- Increased planning dialog concerning student outcomes (I.B.1)
- Developed institution set standards (I.B.3)
- Created Institutional Integrity Committee (I.C)
Key action plans

- Increase collaboration between academic and student services programs (I.B.1)
- Disaggregate learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender for program and course learning outcomes (I.B.2)
- Develop survey of distance education students (I.B.7)
- Develop Continuous Improvement Plan that describes how key integrated planning processes and activities are reviewed, evaluated, and assessed (I.C.5)
- Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom committee will revise the faculty ethics statement (I.C.7)

QFÉ plans

- Produce data to inform recruiting, including student satisfaction, price sensitivity, and academic program demand analysis (I.B.4)
- Update the College website, define and promote points of pride and areas of distinction, promote signature and under-enrolled academic programs, increase marketing to feeder high schools, more clearly market programs to increase enrollments (I.B.9)
Standard II

- **Major outcomes**
  - All instructional programs/student support services are engaged in outcomes assessment using established procedures (II.A.3)
  - Improved course, program, resource allocation, and unit outcomes through learning outcomes assessment and program review (II.A.2, II.C.2)
  - Increased student access through additional student support services (II.C.1, II.C.3)

- **Key action plans**
  - Ensure that all certificate and degree programs can be completed within a reasonable amount of time (II.A.6)
  - Integrate more online learning support services for distance education students (II.B.1)
Standard II

- QFE plans
  - Develop and support an online AA degree that a cohort of students can complete in two years (II.A.1)
  - Develop curriculum to accelerate student completion of remedial education courses (II.A.4)
  - Create Second Year Experience (II.A.6)
  - Determine ways to be more student centered and welcoming; complete seamless process for tracking completion of online orientation; complete common assessment tool that is accessible online; complete automated abbreviated educational plans; complete comprehensive educational plans (II.C.1, II.C.5. II.C.6)
  - Identify and support at-risk students (II.C.2)
  - Increase communication with enrolled students, especially through social media (II.C.3)
  - Identify additional alternative placement models for student assessment (II.C.7)
Standard III

- **Major outcomes**
  - Wrote new Human Resources Plan (III.A.1)
  - Developed new classified hiring prioritization process (III.A.9)

- **Key action plans**
  - Update the Academic Senate Statement on Ethics (I.C.7; III.A.13)

- **QFE plans**
  - Provide professional development for faculty engaging with first-year students (III.A.14)
  - Utilize room scheduling software to support management and operational functions (III.C.4)
  - Develop and institutionalize an enrollment management plan to improve financial stability and better support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness (III.D.1, III.D.2)
Standard IV

Major outcomes
- Wrote the new Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook (IV.A.1)

Key action plans
- Academic Senate and College Council: Compile summary of annual assessments, recommendations, improvements (IV.A.7)

QFE plans
- Develop an enrollment management taskforce to develop and monitor recruitment; consider relationship and reporting structure with the Enrollment Management Team (IV.A.7)
1. **Access**: Improve enrollment management through a goal-driven and strategy-driven marketing, recruiting, and retention plan

2. **Success**: Decrease the average time it takes students to complete awards by improving learner-centered pathways to help students achieve their educational and career goals

**Assessment**: Use existing integrated planning process
Final Statement:
Continuous Quality Improvement

- Improved integrated planning
  - ESMP → committee oversight
  - Closure, refinement, and development of new supporting plans and processes (HR, Tech, Staff Dev, Classified Hiring)

- Refined of program review/SLO assessment process

- Increased use of data in decision making

- Improved succession planning: New and updated policies, handbooks, and plans

- Improved documentation of processes, practices, outcomes for the purpose of improving institutional effectiveness rather than to complete accreditation
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I. Introduction

History of Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles Junior College was established on September 9, 1929 by the Los Angeles Board of Education. The first Associate of Arts degrees were conferred on June 19, 1931. The College was a division of the Los Angeles Secondary School District until 1931, when the electorate voted to establish a separate Los Angeles Junior College District. In 1938, the Board of Education changed the name to Los Angeles City College. In July 1969, the California State Legislature separated the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) from the Los Angeles Unified School District. The LACCD currently comprises nine community colleges and offers educational opportunities to students in more than 40 cities covering an area of more than 882 square miles, serving 5.2 million residents.

Major developments since the last educational quality and institutional effectiveness review

In the past few years, LACC made great strides to streamline its participatory governance structure, and in doing so has created a much more efficient and effective system. The College mission statement was revised to be more focused and inclusive, and the new Educational and Strategic Master Plan was completed to assess the effectiveness of the College in meeting its mission. Integrated planning and governance was streamlined and summarized in a handbook to ensure uniformity and clarity, including a strengthened program review and hiring prioritization process.

The College increased the number of full-time faculty members, providing a motivated and revitalized workforce. The College worked to further engage faculty and staff through the return of the annual classified staff picnic, which reinforces health and nutrition and creates fellowship. Regular town hall meetings on accreditation for faculty and staff ensure that all employees are aware of their responsibilities and can participate in the process.

The College worked to ensure that students are served in efficient, personal, and ultimately beneficial ways. The process to award certificates was streamlined, an online orientation was developed to ensure that students enter the college prepared and knowledgeable of support services provided, and an additional assessment center was created for students to have additional access to English and math assessments. The College has also worked to increase outreach by hiring more staff and instituting an annual breakfast with high school principals and counselors. In an effort to better recognize students for their accomplishments, the College restored the Dean’s High Tea annual event.

LACC worked to improve the quality of information provided to the public. A marketing task force was created to increase enrollments and persistence, and a new campus slogan was created (“LA City College, The City’s College”) and banners were installed to beautify and advertise the campus. The President sends out fall and spring newsletters to communicate directly to the
campus, and publishes a monthly “City Chatter” bulletin highlighting monthly events to increase faculty and staff participation in campus life. The campus worked to ensure that the catalog is available both digitally and in print for the community, and developed a postcard that highlights the campus’s many programs. The College’s Foundation increased donations for scholarships and programs and created the President’s Scholars program to further recognize LACC’s many exemplary students.

LACC worked to improve the quality of its facilities. Since 2009 LACC has completed the following new buildings and modernizations through the ongoing $147 million bond program:

- Clausen Hall modernization, 2015
- Health, Fitness, PE Building (Kinesiology), 2014
- Athletic Field/Track, 2013
- Student Union Building, 2012
- Chemistry Building modernization, 2011
- Jefferson Hall modernization, 2011
- Life Science modernization, 2011
- Food Lab upgrade, 2010
- Franklin Hall modernization, 2010
- Central Plant, 2009
- Science and Technology, 2009
- Site utilities infrastructure, 2009
- Student Lounge, 2009

In addition, the College decided to place all student support services into the currently under-construction Student Services building, which will provide a single location for students to receive the support they need to complete their educational goals. The Foundation also helped acquire a sculpture to beautify the quad.

The College has had the following new senior administrative leadership since 2009:

- Vice President of Student Services Regina Smith, fall 2014
- Interim Vice President of Student Services Randy Anderson, spring-fall 2014
- Vice President of Administrative Services John al-Amin, spring 2014
- President Renée D. Martinez, summer 2012
- Vice President of Academic Affairs Dan Walden, summer 2012
- Associate Vice President Administrative Services Anil Jain, fall 2012
- Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs Mary Callahan, summer 2011-spring 2012

In 2013 LACC received ACCJC approval of a Distance Education Substantive Change request to approve 29 degrees and 12 certificates that students have the opportunity to complete 50 percent or more of required courses toward through online instruction. In 2014 LACC formally communicated to the ACCJC a substantive change for state approved ADTs in Early Childhood Education, Communication Studies, Music, and Psychology. In 2015 the College formally communicated to the ACCJC a substantive change for state approved ADTs in Art History,
Political Science, Administration of Justice, Business Administration, English, Journalism, Math, Physics, Studio Arts, and Theatre Arts.

**Student enrollment data**

**Enrollment Trends.** From 2009-2014 enrollment at LACC remained relatively steady with the exception of non-credit enrollment. The number of non-credit students decreased significantly between fall 2011 and fall 2014, due to the College offering more non-credit sections than usual in 2011. In general, however, enrollment remained steady in all categories for the period.

![Student Headcount by Type, Fall 2009-2014](image)

**Projected Enrollment Trends.** Data from external scans indicate that the projected number of high school graduates in Los Angeles will remain flat or decrease. This trend has important implications for LACC as there is significant competition within and outside of the District for students.
Summary data on service area in terms of labor market, demographic, and socio-economics

Service Area. The LACC service area includes the majority of Central Los Angeles, Hollywood, and other surrounding areas. The College serves a number of neighborhoods that have large, concentrated populations of specific ethnic and linguistic groups, including Koreatown, Little Armenia, and Thai town, among others. LACC competes with Glendale College to the north, Pasadena City College to the northeast, East Los Angeles College to the east, Santa Monica College to the west, and Los Angeles Trade Technical College and West Los Angeles College to the southwest.
Students come from the entire Los Angeles area. Most students come from within a five mile radius of the College. Ten zip codes account for 40 percent of enrolled students.
## Enrollment Concentrations by Zip Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90004</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90029</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90027</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90026</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90020</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90006</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90028</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90038</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90057</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90005</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Top 10 zip codes of students at LACC; data reported for fall semesters*
LACC is one of the most diverse campuses in the United States. In fall 2014, 56 percent of students were female, 48 percent were Hispanic, and 44 percent were under the age of 24. The shifts over the last six years indicate that the Asian population is reducing slightly, Hispanic population continues to increase, and the number of students under 20 has decreased slightly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Changes</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Headcount</strong></td>
<td>20,372</td>
<td>20,981</td>
<td>23,905</td>
<td>21,975</td>
<td>21,890</td>
<td>21,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amer Ind/Other Non-White</em></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-White</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Sub-Continent</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown/Declined to State</strong></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 54</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Educational Characteristics. Data indicate that the majority of students are continuing or have attended the previous semester, are part-time, take less than 12 units, have a goal of transfer to a university, and receive financial assistance. The percentage of students receiving financial aid is increasing. The trends over the past six years indicate that our first-time student population has decreased and the career/workforce goal oriented student population has decreased significantly, and the number of students with a goal of transfer to a four-year school has increased significantly. With over 65 percent of students interested in college preparation, career/workforce, and transfer, the College has developed long-term plans to decrease the time it takes students to complete their educational goals (See Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Characteristics</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>20,372</td>
<td>20,981</td>
<td>23,905</td>
<td>21,975</td>
<td>21,890</td>
<td>21,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Time Student</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Student</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Student</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfer</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent High School Student</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Credit Only</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Load</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 units or more</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 11 units</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 units or less</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit (zero units)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Workforce</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Prep</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to 4 Year</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Decline to State</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No BOGG</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGG / Pell / Other</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names, locations, addresses of sites where 50% or more of program, certificate, or degree is available to students

LACC does not have external sites where 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree is available to students, nor does it have any off-campus sites or centers or international sites. In
2013 LACC received ACCJC approval of a Distance Education Substantive Change request to approve 29 degrees and 12 certificates that students have the opportunity to complete 50 percent or more of required courses toward through online instruction (link to it).

**Specialized or programmatic accreditation held**

LACC offers the following programs with specialized accreditation. Accreditation status and reports submitted to those agencies are posted online at each department website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental Technology</td>
<td>Dental Technology Degree</td>
<td>National Board of Certification in Dental Laboratory Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics</td>
<td>Dietetic Technician Program</td>
<td>Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Human Services Degree</td>
<td>California Association for Alcohol/Drug Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nursing</td>
<td>Registered Nursing Degree</td>
<td>California Board of Registered Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologic Technology</td>
<td>Radiologic Technology Degree</td>
<td>American Registry of Radiologic Technologies and the California Department of Public Health Radiologic Health Branch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards

A. Data on Incoming Students

i. Student Preparedness for College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Level Below</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levels Below</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or More Levels Below</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Level Below</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levels Below</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or More Levels Below</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,168</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ii. Student Training Needs

[add this]

iii. Student Educational Goals

*Emil: this is missing a header with what the columns mean...the years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career/Workforce</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Prep</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to 4 Year</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/DTS</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**B. Data on Enrolled Students**

i. Full-time to Part-time student enrollment

![Student Load Chart]

[separate into two charts: Non DE and DE]

ii. Demographics (Traditional and Distance Education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non DE</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8,711</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>10,210</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>8,003</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,477</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>18,213</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>7,558</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>8,699</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Ind</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,477</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>18,213</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
###iii. Annual Headcount Enrollment

####Student Headcount by Incoming Status, Fall 2009-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC only</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>3,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent HS</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>8,980</td>
<td>9,152</td>
<td>9,622</td>
<td>9,906</td>
<td>9,859</td>
<td>9,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>3,273</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>3,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New transfer</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st time Student</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>1,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

###iv. Course completion, Persistence, Progression, Program, Certificate, Degree, and Transfer

See B. Institution-Set Standards and Aspirational Targets, #2-8
C. Data on Graduates

i. Job Placement, Licensure/certification

See B. Institution-Set Standards and Aspirational Targets, #9 and #10
B. Institution-Set Minimum Standards and Aspirational Targets

a. **Institution-set minimum standards.** The minimum standard is to reach the five-year College average.

b. **Aspirational Targets.** The target is for the College to be within the top 50% of all colleges in the state, based on a five-year average. The College assesses its Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) based on these aspirational targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Definition of the Measure</th>
<th>ESMP Strategy</th>
<th>Minimum Standard and How Determined</th>
<th>5-Year Actual Performance</th>
<th>Most Recent Progress towards Standard</th>
<th>ESMP Target (“Stretch Goal”) and How Determined</th>
<th>5-Year ESMP Target (Statewide Averages)</th>
<th>Most Recent Progress towards Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Full-time equivalent student enrollment</td>
<td>FTES as of Census Day</td>
<td>1.1.1 Efficiently manage enrollment in order to maximize student access to LACC’s educational programs for the purpose of attaining degree and certificate completion and transfer readiness.</td>
<td>Emil Meet FTES base annually</td>
<td>2014-15: 13,530 2013-14: 14,106 2012-13: 13,384 2011-12: 14,276 2010-11: 14,925</td>
<td>Emil 2% increase in FTES (credit and non-credit) per year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Emil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course completion</td>
<td>Annual percentage of credit course enrollment where the student receives a grade of ‘C’ or better</td>
<td>2.1.5: Increase the number of courses completed</td>
<td>63% Standard is to annually meet the College average of course completion over five years, (source of data: Datamart)</td>
<td>2014: 65% 2013: 66% 2012: 62% 2011: 61% 2010: 62%</td>
<td>Exceeded standard 70% by 2020 Target is to be within the top 50% of the state (as of 2014) by the time of our next comprehensive program review in 2020 (source of data: Datamart)</td>
<td>2014: 70% 2013: 70% 2012: 69% 2011: 68% 2010: 68%</td>
<td>On track to meet target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Persistence term to term</td>
<td>Percentage of degree, certificate, and/or transfer seeking students tracked for 6 years, who enrolled in the first 3 consecutive terms</td>
<td>2.1.6: Increase the number of students who persist term to term.</td>
<td>63% (Fa to Spr semesters) Standard is to annually meet the 5-year College average persistence from</td>
<td>2014: 64% 2013: 63% 2012: 63% 2011: 63% 2010: 64%</td>
<td>Exceeded standard 72% (Fa to Spr semesters) by 2020 Target is to be within the top 50% of the state (as of 2014) by the time</td>
<td>2014: 72% 2013: 71% 2012: 70% 2011: 70% 2010: 71%</td>
<td>Below track to meet target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>Definition of the Measure</td>
<td>ESMP Strategy</td>
<td>Minimum Standard and How Determined</td>
<td>5-Year Actual Performance</td>
<td>Most Recent Progress towards Standard</td>
<td>ESMP Target (“Stretch Goal”) and How Determined</td>
<td>5-Year ESMP Target (Statewide Averages)</td>
<td>Most Recent Progress towards Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Progression to next course</td>
<td>Percentage of credit students tracked for 6 years, who first enrolled in a course below transfer level English, ESL, Math and completed a college-level course in the same discipline</td>
<td>2.2.2: Increase the percentage of students who complete basic skills English and Math.</td>
<td>English 37%</td>
<td>English 2014: 37% 2013: 39% 2012: 37% 2011: 34% 2010: 36%</td>
<td>English: Met standard</td>
<td>English 44% by 2020</td>
<td>English 2014: 43% 2013: 44% 2012: 43% 2011: 42% 2010: 42%</td>
<td>English: Below track to meet target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard is to annually meet the 5-year College average progression in English and math (source of data: Student Equity Plan; Scorecard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Program completion</td>
<td>Percentage of degree, certificate, and/or transfer seeking students tracked for 6 years, who completed a degree, certificate, or transfer-related outcome</td>
<td>2.1.0 Increase the percentage of degree, certificate, and/or transfer seeking students tracked for 6 years, who completed a degree, certificate, or transfer-related outcome</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2014: 34% 2013: 40% 2012: 37% 2011: 37% 2010: 38%</td>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2014: 47% 2013: 48% 2012: 49% 2011: 49% 2010: 48%</td>
<td>Below track to meet target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard is to meet the average College success rate over five years (source of data: Scorecard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>Definition of the Measure</td>
<td>ESMP Strategy</td>
<td>Minimum Standard and How Determined</td>
<td>5-Year Actual Performance</td>
<td>Most Recent Progress towards Standard</td>
<td>ESMP Target (“Stretch Goal”) and How Determined</td>
<td>5-Year ESMP Target (Statewide Averages)</td>
<td>Most Recent Progress towards Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Certificate completion</td>
<td>Number of certificates of achievement earned over 6 years</td>
<td>2.1.2: Increase the number of certificates awarded.</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2010: 563</td>
<td>comprehensive program review in 2020; 30% increase from our 2012 (CPR year) total of 479 (source of data: Datamart)</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2010: 736</td>
<td>Exceeded target; consider revising standard upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transfer to four-year institution</td>
<td>Number of first-time College students tracked over 6 years who transferred. (Percentage is based on those who showed behavioral intent to transfer.)</td>
<td>2.1.3: Increase the number of transfers to 4-year universities 2.1.4: Increase the number of ARCC-defined transfer-prepared students.</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2010: 219</td>
<td>By the time of our next comprehensive program review in 2020; indicates an increase of 125 (25 per year for 5 years) from our 2012 (CPR year) total of 274 (source of data: 2012 Datamart).</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>2010: 298</td>
<td>Below standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Alternate approach is to review the percentage of students with intention to transfer who actually transfer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Definition of the Measure</th>
<th>ESMP Strategy</th>
<th>Minimum Standard and How Determined</th>
<th>5-Year Actual Performance</th>
<th>Most Recent Progress towards Standard</th>
<th>ESMP Target (“Stretch Goal”) and How Determined</th>
<th>5-Year ESMP Target (Statewide Averages)</th>
<th>Most Recent Progress towards Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Licensure/ certification exam results</td>
<td>Required for Dietetics, Nursing, Radiologic Technology, Psych CBT, and Dental Technology. The number of students who passed the licensure examination over all who took the examination.</td>
<td>2.1.10: Rates of CTE licensure/exam results are collected annually.</td>
<td>Dietetics: 70% Registered nursing: 75% Radiologic Tech: 75% Dental Tech: 69% Psychology CBT: 70% Standard is set with the individual accrediting agency</td>
<td>Get 3 year historical data (Alex Davis)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dietetics: Registered nursing: 98% Radiologic Tech: 100% Dental Tech: 92% Psychology CBT:</td>
<td>[Same as actual]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job placement/ post training</td>
<td>Required for all CTE departments. The number of students who are employed in the year following completion of a certificate program or degree, over all certificate program or degree completers.</td>
<td>2.1.11: Rates of employment of students graduating from CTE programs are collected annually.</td>
<td>Rad Tech: 75% Dental Tech: 75% Nursing: N/A (find out why not)</td>
<td>Work on this with the EMT (Dan Walden) Alex Davis to purchase software with survey data—including timeline for this in our Self Eval</td>
<td></td>
<td>Radiologic Tech: 84% in 2012-13 Dental Tech: 76% in 2012-13 Registered nursing: 65% in 2012-13</td>
<td>[Same as actual]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting the Standards

The College set its standards using a multi-year analysis of data in College level and program review. Standards for course completion, certificates, and degrees were set in 2012 as part of the comprehensive program review. The standard in these areas was initially set as the college median, and units that were not meeting the median were required to develop unit planning objectives and action plans to improve the measures. When the College began developing a more comprehensive set of standards in early 2015, the decision was made to use five-year averages, since the median in all areas was too high in comparison to other institutions, there were challenges in compiling five-year comparative data based on the median; and the median was inconsistent with how the College decided to track other data elements. (In 2015 the College was placed on “enhanced monitoring” from the ACCJC for not having a job placement standard for its Nursing program. As part of the setting of institution-set standards, the College now meets this requirement.)

All institution-set standards are components of the 2014-20 Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP). The College assesses its performance on all ESMP measures annually. At the College level, committees with oversight over ESMP objectives develop action items and supporting plans to improve the measure. Committees track progress annually and document change. At the unit level, units set their own internal standards and develop planning objectives to improve the measures as part of program review. (For a more detailed discussion, see Standard I.B.3.)

Trends and Interpretation

The College’s priorities since the 2012 comprehensive program review have included a review of low-performing degrees and certificates. Although the College has seen an increase in awards in recent years, 44 percent of College students receive their degrees and certificates after six years, and thus are not counted in the state calculations that are based on a six-year timeframe. The significant increase in program completion seen over the last year is consistent with the state average. After a significant decline in 2012, degrees awarded have increased, with likely factors including the change from English 28 to English 101 and changes to repeatability. Certificates awarded increased drastically in recent years, likely due to underreporting in previous years and an improved mechanism for reporting certificates in recent years.

The College has exceeded its course completion standard for the last two years. Given that the standard is being met, the College will consider revising the standard upwards. The College has seen increases in persistence term to term. The standard is based on data that allows for statewide comparison to our peers and focuses on students interested in transfer or completion. Although the decrease in progression in English and increase in progression in Math is consistent with the state average, the College is below the state average. Although transfers decreased significantly, the College expects an upward adjustment of the most recent year reporting. Look for additional reasons why in the most recent Equity Plan analysis.

**Complete analysis of trends.**
**Especially mention in terms of how it relates to our QFE.**

**Also mention how we use and link to all the disaggregated data in our online program review. Analysis of demographics, DE, etc.**

**Planning**

The College will continue to engage in College level review of ESMP measures, with oversight committees developing action plans and assessing progress towards supporting plans such as the Equity Plan, Basic Skills Plan, Distance Education Plan, and Staff Development Plan. The College will also continue to engage in program review, requiring units to review local standards and develop plans to improve their measures. The College reviews disproportionate impact data on all the measures in which it has institution-set standards, and has plans in place to improve the measures (Student Equity Plan, Basic Skills Plan, and Staff Development Plan).

The College is taking steps to reduce the time to completion of degrees, certificates, and transfer. By decreasing the time to completion of awards, the College will address concerns with student equity; learning support services, counseling and advising, professional development, distance education, and its ability to balance the budget. For further discussion, see the Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #2.
III. Organization of the Self Evaluation Process

The Self Evaluation was a collaborative effort by campus leadership including faculty, staff, and administration. Oversight was provided by the Accreditation Team (A-Team), which was created in 2009 to facilitate the College’s response to being placed on probation and has remained active ever since (A-Team minutes). The A-Team is a standing committee of the College Council and is responsible for ensuring that ACCJC standards are integrated and infused into the operations of the college, facilitating the preparation of all required ACCJC reports, and effectively communicating LACC’s accreditation activities and status (A-Team operating agreement). The A-Team consists of 15 members representing faculty, classified staff, students, and administration. The A-Team’s assessments document committee outcomes (A-Team annual assessments).

In fall 2013 the A-Team organized a core team to oversee the analysis and gathering of evidence required to write the Self Evaluation for its expected ACCJC site visit in spring 2015 (Core team minutes). Core teams included one faculty and one administrator, who solicited campus volunteers to analyze how well the College was meeting the standards, ERs, federal requirements, and policies resulted in actionable improvement plans (Standards analyses). With the release of the new 2014 ACCJC standards and postponement of the site visit to spring 2016, a second round of assessment took place fall 2014.

The fall 2013 and fall 2014 core team analyses resulted in the following major outcomes:

- Campus climate survey of spring 2014 (Part 1 results; Part 2 results) and fall 2015 (Comparative 2014-15 results)
- Creation of the Institutional Integrity committee (link to Institutional Integrity Committee Operating Agreement; link to Institutional Integrity Handbook) to ensure integrity in policies, actions, and communication, with a focus on information posted on the website and printed in the catalog
- Writing and approval of the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook (link)
- Increased use of SharePoint to track planning and resource allocation (Program Review Website)
- Increased campus wide dialogue and education on new mission, new ESMP, and integrated planning process (link to agendas on forums dealing with mission, ESMP)

Under the leadership of the College President and ALO, the core team oversaw campus wide accreditation events, including workshops and presentations at governance committees and in open forums with faculty, classified staff, administration, and students (link to Day of Dialogue agendas).

The Self Evaluation was written by a steering committee of the core team in spring and summer 2015, vetted through participatory governance in early fall 2015, and approved by the Board of Trustees on December 9, 2015 (Timeline for Self Evaluation).

Core Team
Co-Chairs
Dan Walden, Accreditation Liaison Officer and Vice President of Academic Affairs
Daniel Wanner, Accreditation Co-Chair

Steering Committee
Pamela Atkinson, Computer & Network Support Specialist
John Freitas (Co-Chair), President of Academic Senate (through summer 2015)
Anil Jain, Associate Vice President of Administrative Services
Allison Jones, Dean of Academic Affairs
Christine Park, Staff and Organizational Development Coordinator (through summer 2015)
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)
Christine Tinberg, SLO and Assessment Coordinator

Standard I Participants
Jeffrey Nishimura (Co-Chair), Professor of English and Chair of COMPASS
Edward Pai, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (through spring 2015)
Nelines Colon-Paladini, English Literacy/Citizenship Program
Kalynda Webber, Counseling (through 2014)
Bernadette Tchen, English/ESL
Emil Mubarakshin, Research Analyst
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)

Standard II.A and II.B Participants
Todd Scott (Co-Chair), Dean of Academic Affairs
Christine Tinberg (Co-Chair), Campus SLO and Assessment Coordinator
Dorothy Fuhrmann, Library
Liz Gnerre, Library
Andy Mezynski, Library
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)
Barbara Vasquez, Chair of Department Chairs and co-chair of Budget Committee

Standard II.C Participants
Randy Anderson (Co-Chair), Dean Student Services Special Programs
Kamale Gray (Co-Chair since summer 2015), University Transfer Center
Reri Pumphrey (Co-Chair through summer 2015), Counseling
Aida Dzhanunts, Office of Special Services
Will Marmolejo, Dean of Student Enrollment
Olga Ramadan, Dental Technology
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)
Jeremy Villar, Associate Dean of Student Services

Standard III Participants
Anil Jain (Co-Chair), Associate Vice President of Administrative Services
George Dekermenjian (Co-Chair since Summer 2015), Math
Nate Lorentz (Co-Chair through Summer 2015), Chemistry and Earth Sciences
Susana Abramian, Business Office
Kathleen Beaufait, Communication Studies (through spring 2015)
Paul Carlson, Vice President of Administrative Services (through spring 2014)
Bob Garcia, Director of College Facilities, Physical Plant
Juan Mendoza, Manager of College Information Systems
Alex Nelson, Physical Plant
Manny Nuno, Human Resources
Christine Park, Staff and Organizational Development Coordinator (through summer 2015)
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)
Colleen Stringfellow, Executive Assistant to the President
Korla Williams, Academic Affairs

**Standard IV Participants**
John Freitas (Co-Chair), President of Academic Senate (through summer 2015)
Allison Jones (Co-Chair), Dean of Academic Affairs
Arax Cohen, Professor of Dental Technology and co-chair of PRE
Alex Davis, Dean of Economic Development and Workforce Education
Sharon Hendricks, Chapter President, AFT 1521 and co-chair of SPC
Bessie Love, Assessment Center
April Pavlik, Academic Senate Vice President
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)
Andrew Walzer, Foreign Languages & Humanities

**Distance Education Participants**
Todd Scott, Dean of Academic Affairs (through summer 2015)
Carlos Guerrero, Social Sciences, Chair of the Distance Education Committee
Joe Meyer, Social Sciences

**Eligibility Requirements and Policies Participants**
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)
Dan Walden, Accreditation Liaison Officer and Vice President of Academic Affairs
Daniel Wanner, Accreditation Co-Chair and Academic Senate President (from summer 2015)

**Quality Focus Essay Participants**
Dan Walden, Accreditation Liaison Officer and Vice President of Academic Affairs
Daniel Wanner, Accreditation Co-Chair and Academic Senate President (from summer 2015)
Daniel Ruiz, Accreditation Vice-Chair (from summer 2015)
John Freitas, President of Academic Senate (through summer 2015)
Anil Jain, Associate Vice President of Administrative Services
Jeffrey Nishimura, Professor of English and Chair of COMPASS
IV. Organizational Information

*Macz – insert functional map*

**Effectiveness of the division of responsibilities**

Employees know how to get information on District policies and procedures (2014: 65%; 2015: 64%). The College has some concerns, however, with how well the District effectively communicates our values, goals, priorities, and commitment to student learning to our community (2014: 38%; 2015: 41%), whether the District’s services support our campus mission and functions (2014: 36%; 2015: 37%), and whether the Board of Trustees (2014: 28%; 2015: 35%) and Chancellor (2014: 33%; 2015: 43%) provide effective leadership in support of College values, goals, priorities, and commitment to student learning (link to LACC Campus Climate Surveys, 2014, 2015).
V. Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

Evidence of Meeting the ER:
Authority to operate as a post-secondary educational institution and to award degrees

- The College operates and awards degrees by authority of the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (California Community Colleges Chancellors Office)
- The College is governed by the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter I)
- The College is accredited by the ACCJC (ACCJC Directory of Accredited Institutions, September 2015, p.16; ACCJC Letter Reaffirming Accreditation, June 30, 2010)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Los Angeles City College (LACC) is a public two-year community college operating under the authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District. This authority has existed continuously since 1929.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges has accredited LACC since 1952.

2. Operational Status

Evidence of Meeting the ER:

- The College offers classes as part of educational programs (link to 2015-16 College Catalog; Fall 2015 Schedule of Classes)
- The College enrolls students in its programs (Enrollment by Department and Discipline 2013-14 and 2014-15)
- The College awards degrees and certificates (LACC Awards by Department and Discipline from 2008-09 to 2013-14, September 2, 2014)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College is operational. In 2014-15, LACC enrolled X credit and X [Emil Mubarakshin] noncredit students. In 2013-2014, LACC enrolled 18,213 credit and 3,132 noncredit students, with the majority of students indicating their educational goal to transfer to a four-year school
(46%) (Annual College Profile 2014). In 2012-13, the College enrolled 19,240 credit and 2,622 noncredit students (Annual College Profile 2013). In 2011-12, the College enrolled 18,835 credit and 3,102 noncredit students (Annual College Profile 2012). Students are actively pursuing degree programs. Over the past five years, the College has awarded an average of 510 degrees annually (See Section II.B Institution-Set Minimum Standards and Aspirational Targets, #6).

3. Degrees

Evidence of Meeting the ER:

[Emil, Mardeza, April working on this]

- In the 2014-15 College Catalog offers 63 degree programs (X% of total 63 degrees) of two academic years in length, and X% of LACC’s courses lead to those degrees (College Catalog, pp. X-X)
- Each degree has associated course credit requirements and a proposed length of study (coming soon; some have it, some don’t; will be discussed/considered by Thelma Day and April Pavlik)
- The College offers general education courses and specifies the GE requirements for each degree offered (Catalog, pp. X-X)
- The College designates those courses that are transfer level and for which degree credit is granted: UC, CSU, NDA, NC (Catalog, p.24)
- The College enrolls students in all degree programs (Enrollment by Department and Discipline 2013-14 and 2014-15)

Analysis and Evaluation:

In 2014-15, the College offered X degree applicable sections (X% of total) and X% of the College’s students took those degree-applicable courses (link to evidence). Over the past five years, the College has awarded an average of 510 degrees annually (See Section II.B Institution-Set Minimum Standards and Aspirational Targets, #6). Over 40 percent of students indicate that their educational goal is to complete an AA or vocational degree (See Student Educational Goals, Section II.A.iii). A student enrolled full-time can complete the requirements for all AA degrees in two academic years (evidence?).

4. Chief Executive Officer

Evidence of Meeting the ER:

- The College has evidence of certification of full-time responsibility to the institution signed by the College President and governing board (link to Contract of Employment for College President, June 2013)
Analysis and Evaluation:

Reneé D. Martinez has been LACC President since 2012. She received her Master of Arts, Education (University of San Francisco), Bachelor of Arts, Child Development, (California State University of Los Angeles), and Associate of Arts (Mount Saint Mary’s College). She previously was Vice President of Workforce Education and Economic Development, Dean of Workforce Education and Economic Development, and Director/Associate Dean of Student Services at East Los Angeles College. She was a Child Development Professor for 20 years. She currently is a member of numerous professional organizations. She is a resident of Hacienda Heights.

5. Financial Accountability

Evidence of Meeting the ER:

Past, present, and proposed budgets

- 2015-16 Tentative Budget [link to final budget once it’s available]
- 2014-15 Final Budget
- Past final budgets

Certified independent audits, including management letters

- Independent audits [Intranet only; provide the visiting team access]
  - Annual Certified Audit Reports 2014-15
  - Annual Certified Audit Reports 2013-14
  - Annual Certified Audit Reports 2012-13

Foundation [find links to these]

- Annual Foundation Audit Report 2012-13
- Annual Foundation Audit Report 2013-14
- Annual Foundation Audit Report 2014-15

District Bond fund

- Annual Bond Audit Report 2012-13
- Annual Bond Audit Report 2013-14
- Annual Bond Audit Report 2014-15

Financial aid program review/audits

- 2014 LACC Program Review Response Addendum [uploaded]
- 2014 LACC Program Review Response [uploaded]

Student loan default rates and relevant USDE reports

- LACC Cohort Default Rate [uploaded]
- LACC Default Prevention Plan [uploaded]
Analysis and Evaluation:

The College annually undergoes an external financial audit. The College has not received any qualified or adverse opinions in audit reports in the last three years from district, state, or federal programs. For the last three years the College has received an unqualified opinion in its external audit reports (evidence: certified audit reports from last 3 years). The College has implemented all audit recommendations (evidence: “Summary of Findings” in the Annual Certified Audit Report). There have been repeat findings, which are addressed annually (evidence: “Summary of Findings” in the Annual Certified Audit Report).

The results of all external financial audits are presented to the Board of Trustees and posted on the College website (link).

The District has had a positive unrestricted fund balance for the last three years, (evidence: CCFS 311Q at the District Budget Office; District Final Budget Reports). The College does not maintain a minimum 5% unrestricted reserve, although the District has two sets of reserves: a 5% contingency and a 10% reserve (evidence: LACCD Final Budget Report). The State Chancellor’s office has not had to intervene regarding fiscal stability or compliance.

The District has long term debt financing through its Bond program and allocates Bond funding to the college to support approved bond projects. (evidence: Audit Report). In the spring of 2016, the College plans to open a new Student Services Building, as well as complete modernization work on Holmes Hall. Work to modernize DaVinci Hall and the Cesar Chavez Administration Building is anticipated to be completed by spring 2018. (evidence: Bond/Facilities Master Plan). Funding to support facilities projects was provided based on the District Bond program allocation model (evidence: Measure A, AA, and J Bond proposals).

The District has an obligation for OPEB and has completed an actuarial study every other year. The plan for funding OPEB is included in the actuarial report (evidence: Actuarial Study contracted by the District).

The District has a policy that limits accrual of unused vacation time to 400 hours for college employees. Employees are encouraged to use any earned compensatory time prior to end of the fiscal year. (evidence: Leave Accrual Policy, Contractual and Labor Agreements, Board Policy and HR Guide).

The College and the Foundation have an agreement as to the role of the Foundation (evidence:—check Board Rules on the role of the Foundation. The Foundation undergoes an independent audit (evidence: audited financial statements for the last 3 years; in the CFO’s office).

The College follows District policies and procedures regarding purchasing (evidence: LACCD website at the contracts office--Anil) and has local policies and procedures as well (evidence: see the LACC website purchasing forms and manual here). The District provides training about purchasing policies and procedures and the College sends out periodic notice about purchasing policies and procedures to ensure they are being followed (evidence: emails). The college
website also has up to date information on all policies and procedures

The College’s integrated planning cycle ensures that the budget is developed out of program
review and college level planning (evidence: Integrated Planning handbook: annual budget
prioritizations based on program review). (For more information see Standard III.D.4.)

The College reviews its student financial aid obligation through USDE financial aid audits
(evidence: 1999 and 2008 USDE financial aid audits) and state audits that occur every three
years (Jeremy?). The District also hires independent auditors annually, and results are posted
online at the District website (evidence: http://albacore.laccd.edu/fis/budget_dev/documents/2013-
2014LACCDFinancialAuditReport.pdf). The most recent USDE financial aid audit included an
issue with exclusion rosters. A policy was enacted in summer 2015 to address the exception (link
to E13 Attendance Accounting and Grade Collection).

VI. Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Federal
Regulations and Commission Policies (Checklist)

Add bullets in all sections…make sure to include those elements in the checklist that are not
covered in the standards (such as student complaints, DE, and institution set standards)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment</th>
<th>Where Cited in Self Evaluation/ Other Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.</td>
<td>The CEO has notified the campus community and public of the upcoming review. The College has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of its evaluation visit, with the Third Party Comment Form having been posted online on September 21, 2015 (Accreditation Website).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party comment.</td>
<td>See below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Records of Accreditation
• The College maintains all correspondence and records on its accreditation history, substantive change applications, and outcomes of the applications (Accreditation website “Reports Submitted to ACCJC”)

Information Collection
• The College involved broad and appropriate constituent groups in the preparation and process of the Self Evaluation (see Section III: Organization of the Self Evaluation Process)
• Records of formal student complaints and grievances (see Standard XXX)
• The College has submitted substantive change proposals as required (see Standard XXX)

Accreditation Decisions
• The required language on accreditation status is in the Catalog and on the website one click away from the homepage, and programs with independent accreditation list their accreditation status on their websites (see Standard I.C.1)
• The College has responded to recommendations in the timeframe required (see Standard I.C.12)

Third Party Comment
• CEO has notified the campus community and public of the upcoming review
• The College has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of its evaluation visit, with the Third Party Comment Form having been posted online on September 21, 2015 (Accreditation Website)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement</th>
<th>Where Cited in Self Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution’s mission.</td>
<td>Standard I.B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.</td>
<td>Standard I.B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-</td>
<td>Standard I.B.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits, Program length, and Tuition</th>
<th>Where Cited in Self Evaluation/ Other Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).</td>
<td>All AA degrees require at least 60 units (see Standard II.A.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).</td>
<td>Standard II.A.5  Standard II.A.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).</td>
<td>Tuition for all degree programs is the same (California Education Code 72252; Catalog, p.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education’s conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits.</td>
<td>• All AA degrees require at least 60 units (see Standard II.A.5)  • Credit hour is defined based on Carnegie Rule and Title 5 regulations (see Standard II.A.9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Policies</th>
<th>Where Cited in Self Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.</td>
<td>Standard II.A.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.</td>
<td>Standard II.A.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit.</td>
<td>Standard II.A.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance Education and Correspondence Education</th>
<th>Where Cited in Self Evaluation/ Other Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has policies and procedures for</td>
<td>The College does not offer correspondence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Define and classify a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions. (see Standard II.A.5)

There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student’s grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily “paperwork related,” including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed). (Standard II.A.2)

The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected. (Standard II.A.2)

The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings. (Standard III.C.1, III.C.2)

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education.

- DE relation to College mission: Standard I.A.3
- DE courses and programs development, implementation, and evaluation: Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3
- DE course and program learning outcomes: Standard I.B.1
- Resources to support learning outcomes: Standards II.B.1, II.C.1, III.B.1, III.C.1
- Notice of DE Substantive Change: Standard I.B.5

### Student and Public Complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Where Cited in Self Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that</td>
<td>Standard I.C.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.

| The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and govern mental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities. | Standard I.C.1 |
| The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Representation of Accredited Status and the Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions. | Standard I.C.1 Standard I.C.8 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials</strong></th>
<th><strong>Where Cited in Self Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.1 Standard I.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status.</td>
<td>Advertising, Publications, Promotional Literature (Catalog: Standard I.C.2); Student Recruitment (Standard I.C.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title IV Compliance</strong></th>
<th><strong>Where Cited in Self Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.13 Standard III.D.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.13 Standard III.D.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.13 Standard III.D.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.13 Standard III.D.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations and the Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV.</td>
<td>Standard I.C.13 Standard II.B.4 Standard III.D.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. Institutional Analysis

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

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans and implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties.

Standard I.A. Mission

Standard I.A.1.
The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The LACC mission statement reads as follows: “Los Angeles City College empowers students from the diverse communities it serves to achieve their educational and career goals by providing learner-centered pathways to success through transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills programs.” (link to mission on the main page)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes: (a) “transfer” to four-year colleges, (b) “career and technical education” leading to vocational degrees and certificates, and (c) “foundational” skills.

The mission describes the College’s intended student population as “students from the diverse communities it serves.” The majority of students are female, Hispanic/Latino, under 24 years old, receiving financial aid, and interested in transfer to four-year institutions; and approximately 80% of the population is non-white (Annual College Profile Fall 2014). The College continually assesses its local community and actual student populations in term of race, gender, age, and economic status (Student Equity Plan: Access, p. X).

The mission broadly defines the types of degrees and certificates that empower students to “achieve their educational and career goals.” All locations on the College website where the mission statement is present include a link to its 69 Associate of Arts degrees, 42 certificates of achievement, and 93 skills certificates through 29 academic programs (link to the links). Of the
69 AA degrees, 14 were recently converted to ADTs, which reflects the College’s commitment
to helping students meet their educational goals.

The mission describes the College’s commitment to student learning and student achievement
“by providing learner-centered pathways to success.” The mission reflects the educational goals
of students, with 52 percent interested in transfer and college preparation, 15 percent in
career/workforce, and 17 percent in general education (See Section II: Student Achievement
Data and Institution-Set Standards; Part iii: Educational Goals).

The mission provides the preconditions for setting the goals and objectives of the College’s
Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP), which inform campus planning and decision-
making. The goals of the ESMP directly align with the mission: access (“empowers students
from the diverse communities it serves”), student success (“to achieve their educational and
career goals”), organizational effectiveness (“providing learner-centered pathways to success”),
and resources (“through transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills
programs”). The ESMP also includes several objectives that align with the mission: transfer,
degrees, and career and technical education and certificates (Objectives 1.1 and 2.1) and basic
skills (Objectives 1.2 and 2.2) (link to ESMP).

**Distance Education.** The College’s distance education mission statement directly incorporates
language from the mission: “Distance Education at LACC empowers its students from the
diverse communities it serves to achieve their educational and career goals by providing
learner-centered pathways to success through transfer, career and technical education, and
foundational skills programs” (link to Distance Education Plan, p. X). The student profile of
traditional and DE students is similar (See Section II.B.ii. Demographics: Traditional and
Distance Education).

**Action Plan:** The College will meet the standard by revising the mission to reflect the “degrees
and other credentials it offers.” The revision will occur through the governance structure in
spring and summer 2016 and will be ready for District consideration by fall 2016.

**Standard I.A.2.**

*The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether
the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

The College determines how effectively it is accomplishing its mission by assessing progress
towards its Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP).

**Use of Data**

- The mission statement and ESMP are updated every six years using a comprehensive set
  of data, including college profiles, student access and achievement, analysis of previous
  planning outcomes, and internal and external scans, which ensure that the mission and
ESMP are linked to the needs of our student population (2013 Strategic Planning Databook).

- Data used to assess the ESMP goals and objectives includes college profiles, summary of unit planning objectives, internal and external data, surveys, budget summaries, student learning and service unit outcome assessment data (ESMP Data Sets 2014-15 Update).
- Data is disaggregated by race, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other factors of the student population (See Standard I.B.6—Emil to add hyperlink).
- For a complete list of data used in assessment, see Standard I.B.4.

Processes to Evaluate Effectiveness and Success

- The College has an identified process for using data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission and for ensuring the mission directs institutional priorities (Integrated Planning Handbook, pp.5-6 and Appendix E; Strategic Planning Databook Flowchart).
- The College sets annual priorities based on a review of the College’s achievement of ESMP goals (link to 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 Priorities).
- The ESMP Implementation Grid operationalizes the implementation and oversight of ESMP objectives and identifies assessment data (ESMP Implementation Grid).
- Relation of Outcomes Assessment to Fulfilling LACC’s Mission Diagram (link—Tinberg? What is this?)

Analysis and Evaluation:

College wide and local unit planning makes it possible for the College to measure achievement of its mission.

```
LACC Mission
    ↓
ESMP Goals
    ↓
ESMP Objectives
Assessed through ESMP measures, ESMP Implementation Grid, and measures from related plans
    ↑
Oversight committee recommendations
Assessed through committee annual assessments and ESMP progress reports
    ↑
Unit planning objectives
Assessed through ESMP measures as part of comprehensive and annual program review
    ↑
Program plans
Created through PSLO assessment
    ↑
Course plans
Created through CSLO assessment
```
ESMP oversight committees annually use updated data set to evaluate progress towards institution-set standards and targets specified in the ESMP implementation grid (ESMP Progress Reports). The data is disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, age, disability, and economic status of the student populations to help assess whether the College is meeting its mission of “[empowering] students from the diverse communities it serves.” (See Standard I.B.6.) The ESMP also aligns with the District’s Strategic Plan and College plans including the Basic Skills, Student Equity, Student Success and Support Programs (SSSP), Achieving the Dream (AtD), Facilities Master Plan, Distance Education Plan, Human Resources Plan, and Technology Resources Plan. All these plans share performance measures with the ESMP (Table 1) and review of progress towards supporting plans occurs through the same ESMP progress reports and through annual committee assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California Community Colleges System Strategic Plan, 2013</th>
<th>LACCD Strategic Plan 2012-17 Goals</th>
<th>LACC ESMP 2014-20 Goals</th>
<th>Related LACC Plans</th>
<th>Shared Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Awareness and Access</td>
<td>Access &amp; Preparation for Success</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Student Success Support Plan</td>
<td>Matriculation completion rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic skills first-year enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion-based class schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success and Readiness</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning for Success</td>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td>Equity Plan</td>
<td>Number of certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Skills Plan</td>
<td>Number of degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AtD Plan</td>
<td>Course completion rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Education Plan</td>
<td>Basic skills completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Development Plan</td>
<td>Transfer rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Effectiveness</td>
<td>Organizational Effectiveness</td>
<td>Organizational Effectiveness</td>
<td>Accreditation Standards</td>
<td>Persistence rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development; Partnerships for Economic and Workforce Development</td>
<td>Resources and Collaboration</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>Achievement gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Resources Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Development Plan</td>
<td>Fusion index for building maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology available to students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology replacement standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Alignment of Plans and ESMP Performance Measures

The College has identified performance measures to determine progress towards meeting its four ESMP goals (ESMP Implementation Grid). The evaluation of these measures occurs throughout the integrated planning cycle. In reviewing the mission, the College reviews external and internal scans both qualitative and quantitative in nature (Integrated Planning Handbook, p. 5--check page). The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) uses similar data to recommend to the College Council the annual ESMP priorities for the upcoming fiscal year (link to 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 Priorities).
Standard I.A.3.
The institution’s programs and services are aligned with its mission. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Alignment of programs and services with mission
- The College establishes its student learning programs and services from its ESMP, which serves as the operational component of the mission (ESMP)
- As part of the comprehensive program review, all College units are asked to review their unit in terms of how it supports the College mission (2012-13 CPR Program Overview Reports)

The mission guides planning, decision-making, and resource allocation
- The integrated planning cycle ensures that ESMP objectives and annual priorities inform unit planning and resource allocation (Integrated Planning Handbook, pp.16-17)
- Committees with oversight of ESMP goals and objectives provide or revise institutional actions or strategies based on data analysis, and identify resource needs with anticipated costs (2014-2020 ESMP Implementation Grid; ESMP Progress Reports)
- Through program review the College evaluates the performance of its units, resulting in unit plans that align with the goals of the ESMP, and resource requests to support those plans (link to home pages for 2012-2013 CPR; 2013-2014 Annual Program Review; 2014-2015 Annual Program Review; 2015-2016 Annual Program Review)
- College plans indicate how they support the mission:
  - Distance Education Plan [link, p. X]
  - Human Resources Plan [link, p. X]
  - Technology Resources Plan [link, p. X]
  - Staff Development Plan [link, p. X]
  - Continuous Improvement Plan [link, p. X]

The mission informs goals for student learning and achievement
- The College assesses student learning and achievement through its ESMP, particularly in Goal 2: Student Success, which includes the institution-set standards the College determines as critical to evaluating its mission (ESMP implementation grid, Goal 2)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College’s integrated planning cycle is ongoing (see Standard I.B.1) and ensures that programs and services support the mission. The College assesses its student learning programs and services using ESMP measures. The integrated planning cycle ensures that ESMP objectives and annual priorities inform unit planning and resource allocation. Each of the ESMP goals includes objectives whose focus is to support student learning and achievement. Oversight committees responsible for ESMP measures develop supporting action plans, which are
documented and tracked through committee annual assessments and ESMP progress reports (ESMP Progress Reports). Supporting plans include descriptions of how local objectives support the goals and objectives of the ESMP.

As part of both comprehensive and annual program review all units use assessment and analysis of data to create unit planning objectives that directly address ESMP goals and priorities (link to Integrated Planning Handbook). Resource request prioritization committees use a rubric (link) to determine how well requests support the ESMP, will improve access and success measures, and will address other College needs. Thus, requests are prioritized based on how well they support the ESMP and the mission.

**Distance Education.** Although DE is not specifically mentioned in the mission, the College’s DE mission statement is congruent with the College mission (See Standard I.A.1).

**Action Plan:** The College will consider if the mission should include any statements related to its commitment to Distance Education. The consideration will take place in the governance structure in spring and summer 2016 and if appropriate will be ready for District consideration by fall 2016.

**Standard I.A.4.**
The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

**Widely published**
- The mission statement is printed in the College catalog and all schedules of classes (College Catalog; College Schedule of Classes)
- The mission statement is on the College website home page
  [to do: Peter Anzeline to add the mission to the main page]
- The mission statement is posted online at the accreditation website and is one click away from the main page (Accreditation website)

**Approved by Board of Trustees**
- The Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees approved the revised mission on June 25, 2014 (LACCD Board of Trustees, 2014. p.5).

**Periodic review and updating**
- The College most recently updated its mission in 2013-2014 (Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook 2015, pp.5-6)
- All major participatory governance committees contributed to the 2013-14 revision of the mission statement and the revised mission was approved by the College president on December 19, 2013 (LACC College Council Recommendation #90)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
The mission is published online and in all College publications. Committee agendas and minutes include the mission statement. Posters, postcards, and business cards with the mission statement have been widely distributed to all campus stakeholders. Most employees are familiar with the mission statement (2014: 81%; 2015: 82%). An overwhelming majority agree the work they do contributes to the mission (2014: 89%; 2015: 90%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

The mission statement is reviewed and revised every six years prior to the updating of the ESMP (Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook 2015, pp.5-6). During this review and revision, all key campus constituents meet to ensure that the mission remains relevant to student learning, that it continues to address the needs of our student population, and that it aligns with the District mission and strategic plan. The mission is revised in response to data collected from internal program review and external scans. As an example, in 2013-2014 workgroups and committees reviewed internal and external data including the District Strategic Plan, college profiles, results of the assessment of the strategic master plan, college priorities, the Student Success Scorecard (ARCC 2.0), Achieving the Dream measures, student surveys, the results of the most recent comprehensive program review, and external scans (2013 Strategic Planning Databook). An analysis of this data in committee and group discussions revealed that the old mission was too long and did not accurately reflect the direction of the College. The decision was made to streamline the statement and focus on the College’s educational purposes, intended student population, types of programs offered, and commitment to student learning and student achievement. A Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) workgroup developed a draft mission statement that was vetted at the College Council and Department Chairs Council, revised by the SPC, vetted at the Classified Symposium, presented at the Associated Student Government (ASG) Senate, and reviewed by the Academic Senate. The SPC, Academic Senate, College Council, President (LACC College Council Recommendation #90) and District Board of Trustees (LACCD Board of Trustees, 2014. p.5) approved the final version.

**Distance Education.** The College’s DE mission statement is congruent with the College mission statement and further states that the DE program “strives to meet the needs of all its students while maintaining support for instructors using web-based or web-enhanced classes.” The purposes of offering DE courses are to satisfy student demand and provide additional opportunities for current students to complete their educational goals. The DE mission and vision statements were written by the Distance Education Committee using the revised College mission statement as a framework. The DE mission statement was approved by the Academic Senate on December 5, 2013 (Academic Senate Resolution #03-F13: Approval of the LACC Guide to Distance Education).

**Standard I Evidence List**

Xxxx [number + full name of document]…in body, only use the number of the evidence]
Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

Academic Quality

Standard I.B.1.
The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

How the College has structured its dialogue:

- Learning outcomes (Tinberg)
  - Sustained dialogue is a requirement throughout the assessment process for all units (Administrative Services Handbook, p.; Academic Affairs Course Student Learning Outcome Handbook p.4, 7, 13, 15 and Program Student Learning Outcome Handbook, p. 2, 6, 15; Student Services Handbook p. 10-steps 7&9, 13, 14)
  - SLO Department Coordinator is responsible for leading a substantial and collegial discussion about student learning at department meetings (SLO Dept Coordinator Responsibilities)
  - SLO Course Coordinator is responsible for involving all faculty in the discussion regarding the creation of SLOs, assessment tasks, rubrics, and action plans (SLO Course Coordinator Responsibilities)
  - The “group scoring” method, in which dialog is performed in the “norming” sessions, is a best practice for assessing courses SLOs (CSLO Assessment Handbook, p. X)
  - Some academic units use the “group scoring” method to assess CSLOs (esl, PE 225, another?)
  - All academic departments must hold formal discussions regarding SLO assessments at a department meeting during the first two months of each semester, record the discussions using the approved SLO Dialogue Form and submit the SLO Dialogue Form to the SLO Coordinator (Resolution #2-Fa15 SLO Assessment Dialogue, completed dialog forms).
  - Programs dialog to analyze results and create action plans (English 101 Discussion Participants Fall 2015, English 101 Discussion follow up email, 102, 103, Non-credit FLEX Day agenda, Non-credit Discussion Participants, Non credit SLO Reflection form)
  - Agendas for both the 2014 and 2015 Annual SLO Kickoffs for Student Services included sharing of assessment results and action plans (2014-15 Kickoff Agenda, 2015-16 Kickoff Agenda)
  - Student Services Assessment Timelines includes specific dates for sharing results and plans at a Student Services Council meeting (SS 2013-14 Timeline, SS 2014-15 Timeline, SS 2015-16 Timeline previous minutes where talk about assessments something in 2012, 13, 14)
• Student Services SLO Workgroup dialogs about student outcomes (Workgroup Meetings)
• The SLO&A Committee dialogs about individual units assessment processes and results (SLO&A Committee minutes when reviewing assessment reports)
• The SLO Annual Report is shared in all governance committees (link to minutes)
• The SLO&A Committee reports monthly to College Council, EPPIC, and Academic Senate (link to minutes)
• SLO Spotlights are delivered at Academic Senate meetings (link to minutes)
• Dialogue occurred in various venues regarding the revision of ISLOs (ASG minutes, Academic Senate, EPPIC, Student Services)
• Faculty dialogued about our GE Program Mission, Description, Goals, Outcomes (GE Outcomes Workshop)
• SLOs were explained to classified staff (SLO Presentation Classified Staff )
  • Student achievement and student equity
    o Monthly, sustained dialog occurs in COMPASS, which serves as the institutional data team and reviews data towards ESMP goals
    o Bi-monthly dialog in EPPIC meetings cover review of unit level student achievement data compiled for and assessed in program review
    o Sustained dialog regarding student equity occurs through the implementation of ESMP strategies (ESMP 2.3.1 and 2.3.2) that focus on closing achievement gaps between ethnicities and gender.
    o The College Student Equity Plan (ESMP strategy 2.3.3) focuses on disaggregated student access and success measures (link to Plan).
      ▪ Dialog and action planning towards meeting these strategies occur in COMPASS (minutes) and are shared with the campus through committees including the Academic Senate (minutes) and College Council.
  • Academic quality
    o Monthly, sustained dialogue on academic quality occurs in the Curriculum Committee through course approvals and updates, EPPIC viability studies with required open forums, in units as part of comprehensive and annual program review, Distance Education committee in its review of quality of the course delivery method, and in SPC as part of ESMP goal assessment (link to samples)
    o As part of comprehensive program review, validation teams are randomly assigned units and use a rubric “norming” to complete blind online evaluations, with the results shared with the unit for improvement (link to CPR validation rubric)
    o Annual program reviews are validated by the dean/manager and results are shared at EPPIC and disseminated to the campus (EPPIC Summary)
  • Institutional effectiveness
    o Sustained and substantial dialogue on institutional effectiveness occurs in all college governance committees and is documented in committee annual assessments (link to annual assessment template or provide a few samples)
    o As part of the review of the College mission statement and ESMP goals and objectives, the College engages in substantial dialogue about student access and
student success, focus on student learning and achievement (*Integrated Planning Handbook*; *link to minutes of discussions of mission and ESMP*)

- SPC oversees dialog, in the form of committee progress reports and program review, on ESMP data measures to be used for program assessment, so that the college can analyze and improve its programs and services (ESMP Implementation Grid)
- Committees that oversee ESMP objectives use the results of program review, along with a review of campus wide data, to discuss and generate recommendations towards the goal of continuous improvement of student learning and achievement (*committee annual assessments*)
- The participatory governance committee structure supports collegial dialogue and dissemination of information (*Integrated Planning Handbook*—*link to committee chart*)
- Days of Dialogue cover a wide range of topics ranging from access, student success, and accreditation measures (*Days of Dialogue link*)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

**Student Outcomes**
Since we started assessing outcomes in 2007 (?) the College has emphasized and valued collaboration and communication throughout the assessment process. From 2007 until September 2012, the college did not have a written assessment process. But, it was expected that faculty work together to write the SLOs and to design the assessment tasks and rubrics. Also, it was expected that each piece of student work be scored by at least three faculty members, who then compared their scores, discussed any differences, and decided upon a final score (*links to former score sheets*). Each time they met, faculty signed a form attesting to their participation (*link to forms*).

The SLO Committee engages in meaningful dialog as it studies assessment best practices and evaluates the College’s assessment processes (minutes). The SLO Committee Chair delivers reports at the various governance committee meetings (*link to minutes with substance*).

In September 2012, our first assessment handbooks were written (link or original handbooks) and stated (what did they say about dialog in here – *link to page number*). In spring 2015, the revised CSLO Assessment and PSLO Assessment Handbooks were approved by Academic Senate – dialog continues to be stressed. dialog requirements stated in the handbooks (*Academic Affairs Course Student Learning Outcome Handbook* p.4, 7, 13, 15 and *Program Student Learning Outcome Handbook*, p. 2, 6, 15).

the SLO Committee revised the course assessment process giving faculty the option to score individually or with a group (*link to minutes, handbook page*). Our current handbook states that group scoring is a best practice because of the potential for greater dialog so faculty can learn from each other. There are courses where group scoring and substantial dialog still occurs (*links*). But, to ensure that we still structure our process to promote and require dialog, in September 2015, the Academic Senate adopted a resolution that all academic departments must
hold formal discussions regarding SLO assessments at a department meeting during the first two months of each semester, record the discussions using the approved SLO Dialogue Form and submit the SLO Dialogue Form to the SLO Coordinator (Resolution #2-Fa15 SLO Assessment Dialogue, completed dialog forms). Departmental discussions are led by the SLO Department Coordinators (link to responsibility docs, dialog forms). In our noncredit program, their 2015 Faculty Symposium event included one hour of SLO-related discussions where faculty reviewed results and created action plans (link to agenda, sign in sheets, reflection form, powerpoint). Course Coordinators lead discussion to analyze results and create action plans when multiple sections/instructors of a course were assessed. (link to English …….)

In Student Services, each year we hold an Annual SLO Kickoff with time set aside for units to discuss their assessment results and plans (agendas, page in handbook with this as step 1). SLOs are an agenda item at each Student Services Council meeting (link to minutes of 10.13.15, need more minutes). Their Assessment Timeline establishes specific dates when proposals and reports will be shared (link to timeline). The Student Services SLO Workgroup meets to review assessment proposals and reports (committee charge doc, minutes).

In addition, other occasions have given occasion to talking about student outcomes. In month, year, a General Education Workshop involved X faculty where they discussed the general education program mission and outcomes (link to sign in documents, presentation). Academic Senate agendas include an SLO Spotlight when time allows and faculty believe they have something of interest for all to hear (link to minutes). In month, year, Classified Staff learned about outcomes and had a chance to ask questions at the Classified Staff X (link to agenda, presentation). Talk about revising our ISLOs began last semester and this fall there will be opportunities for all campus stakeholders to join the discussion (epic minutes, ss council minutes).

The most recent revision of the mission and Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) occurred using the participatory governance structure over the course of several months. The plan was published and circulated throughout the campus to ensure broad knowledge of College goals and objectives. There was a great deal of dialogue and debate on the nature of Program Review and its role in the campus during this time. The number of employees who are familiar with the ESMP (2014: 56%; 2015: 66%) indicates that the dialogue is increasing awareness (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

Program review processes are shared via trainings (PR training in Spr 2014, Fall 2014, etc.) and campus wide presentations (minutes such as DW’s presentation to Senate on Sept 17; Ed/Phil Aug 2013 presentation, student services review of measures, etc.). Evidence of the effectiveness of these trainings and presentations can be seen in the level of satisfaction with program review processes (2013-14 campus climate survey, section 7.3) and compliance with program review requirements (2014 Program Review Non-compliance List; 2015 EPPIC Program Review Summary).

Dialogue occurs in the following settings and processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dialogue</th>
<th>When and How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[add link after each of the elements below with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that it is occurring</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student outcomes, academic quality, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement (Unit level)</td>
<td>SLOs – department meeting – role of SLO Program Coordinator to initiate dialog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive program review at the unit level every six years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between unit and dean/manager as part of program review validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student outcomes, academic quality, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement (College level)</td>
<td>In SPC meeting through ESMP implementation grid assessments by oversight committees and through committee annual assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO Committee reports delivered at committees: Academic Senate, EPPIC, SPC, and College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student equity (Unit level)</td>
<td>Through review of disaggregated data in comprehensive program review at the unit level every six years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaggregated ISLO data included in 2015-16 SLO Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student equity (College level)</td>
<td>Through the Equity Plan, which is presented and discussed at committees including COMPASS, EPPIC, SPC, Academic Senate, and College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional effectiveness</td>
<td>Annual assessment of processes in oversight committees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Program review, including budget processes, in PRE, EPPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Learning/service unit outcomes assessment processes in SLO&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o College planning in SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website and catalog processes in the Institutional Integrity Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and staff agree that sustained dialogue has led to a collective understanding of the meaning of evidence, data, and research used in the evaluation of student learning. Faculty and staff agree that their department/program/discipline engages in ongoing and robust dialogue about improving student learning (2014: 60%, 2015: 68%); have reviewed useful data about their units (2014: 53%; 2015: 58%); and that their unit uses data for planning, evaluation, and program improvement (2014: 59%; 2015: 67%). Employees agree that their unit has sufficient research and data to assess progress toward achieving stated SLOs (2014: 56%; 2015: 66%). (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015.)
Units are instructed on how to review data through program review trainings (*link to minutes*). Committees are instructed on how to review data through ESMP oversight trainings (*link to minutes*). As annual trainings occur and the College becomes more familiar with how to use data for evaluation, we would expect those numbers to improve.

**Distance Education.** Dialogue on the continuous improvement of student learning through DE and how it compares to learning in traditional programs occurs in DE Committee meetings (*link to agendas*). The DE Committee chair is required to make regular reports to EPPIC and the Academic Senate (*link to agendas*). The DE Committee reviews its progress on the DE Plan through annual assessments, which are written in the committee and reported to EPPIC and the Academic Senate (*link to annual assessments*). Through comprehensive and annual program review, units are given comparative data on student achievement and student learning in the DE and traditional modalities (*link to data*). The College has a Distance Education Plan that outlines DE strategic planning, objectives in support of the ESMP, and strategies to meet those objectives (*link to DE Plan*).

**Action Plan.** Increase dialogue between academic and student services programs through ongoing collaborative meetings, towards improved recruitment.

**Standard I.B.2.**
The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Development of courses, programs, certificates, and degrees
- Course Outline of Record (*link to blank COR*)
- Proposed New Program Request (*link to blank PNPR*)
- Curriculum Handbook (*coming soon*)
- Distance Education Plan (*link*)

Course evaluation/assessment/improvement
- See Standard II.A.3., *p. X*

Instructional programs, certificates and degrees evaluation/assessment/improvement
- 100% of instructional programs, certificates and degrees have defined PSLOs (*PSLOs for Instructional Programs*, catalog, website)
- The College has a procedure for identifying and assessing instructional PSLOs (*PSLO Assessment Handbook, senate approval of these docs – min?*)
- One PSLO for each certificate and degree should be assessed annually (*Senate Resolution 02-S14*)
- Each department has an assessment plan identifying which PSLO to assess each year (*Assessment plans*)
- X% of certificates and degree programs have completed one outcomes assessment cycle
• X% of certificates and degrees have completed more than one outcomes assessment cycle
• PSLO assessment reports, that include data analysis and action plans, are publicly accessible (Prgm Assmnt Reports by department, by year, link to some old and some new)
• PSLO assessment is included in annual and comprehensive program review (link to APR and CPR Manuals, PSLO Assessment Handbook, p.X)
• Improvements to ……
• SLO Annual Report

Role of faculty
• The SLO & Assessment Committee is comprised primarily of faculty (link to SLO&A operating agreement)
• Writing and assessing CSLOs and PSLOs is a faculty obligation (AFT Contract, Appendix Q, p. 294, List A, #7; AFT Contract Interpretation Clarification of the Meaning of “Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Cycle” on the Faculty Evaluation Form)
• Each academic department has at least one faculty member to shepherd its assessment process (Department Coordinator Responsibilities, List of Dept Coordinators).
• Annual and comprehensive program review is designed and overseen by PRE and EPPIC, which are subcommittees of the Academic Senate and comprised primarily of faculty. (link to PRE and EPPIC operating agreements)

Use of disaggregated data for analysis of student learning
• See Standard I.B.6., p. X

Learning support services assessment and evaluation
• For the Library see Standard II.B.3, p. X
• For the other support service see Standard II.C.2, p.X

Analysis and Evaluation:

All instructional programs have PSLOs, approved by the Curriculum Committee, which are listed in the college catalog and on each department’s website. (Curriculum Committee spreadsheet & minutes links). Identifying and assessing PSLOs is the responsibility of the faculty (PSLO Assessment Handbook, p.X, AFT Contract, Appendix Q, p. 294, List A, #7; AFT Contract Interpretation Clarification of the Meaning of “Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Cycle” on the Faculty Evaluation Form).

The process for assessing instructional PSLOs is established by the Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee, a twelve-member committee, of which seven members must be faculty (operating agreement). The Committee documents the process in the PSLO Assessment Handbook and revises it as our process evolves and as eLumen, our assessment software, increases its capabilities. The Academic Senate must approve all resolutions and major revisions.
to the handbook (Resolutions, PSLO Assessment Handbook, Senate’s May minutes). One such resolution is that each department is required to have an assessment plan that identifies one PSLO to be assessed each year for each degree and/or certificate (Academic Senate Resolution #02-S14, Assessment Plan). PSLO assessments are led by the SLO Department Coordinator(s) (Department Coordinator Role and Responsibilities). Each department has at least one Department Coordinator. Larger departments such as English, Foreign Language, and Math have more than one (list of faculty). Department coordinators receive regular training and support (SLO Check-Ups, eLumen PSLO Assessment Instructions).

The instructional PSLO assessment process is reliant on curriculum mapping and authentic assessments tasks. Faculty may assess them using either the results from unique assessment tasks or results from one or more CSLOs where students demonstrated mastery of the PSLO (PSLO Assessment Handbook, Step 3, p.X). The assessment method, results, and action plan are included in the PSLO assessment report. Guiding questions assist faculty in analyzing the data in terms of how they program can be improved (PSLO Assessment Handbook, p. X). Previously, faculty completed PSLO assessment reports as Word documents, which were loaded onto SharePoint (link to docs). Beginning fall 2015, we will use eLumen’s modified Strategic Initiative Cycle as our reporting mechanism for our PSLO assessments.

The results of PSLO assessment are one way in which programs evaluate student achievement and learning. Therefore, in annual program review, programs use their PSLO action plan(s) to create new unit planning objective(s). For a thorough description of the program review process, see Standard XXX. For instance, find some examples. Programs also report on the status of their unit planning objectives. Find some examples where they say they implemented a plan and commented on it.

Can I disaggregate PSLO data?

Results of evals

What improvements occurred?

PSLO statements may be revised at any time, but they are intentionally evaluated through the comprehensive program review process, using the PSLO Rubric (link). (link to SLO CPR results; link to list of programs that revised their PSLOs based on the assessment—Tinberg to create; link to annual program review results).

An overwhelming majority of employees are aware of the learning outcomes for each of the courses they teach (2014: 85%; 2015: 83%). A majority of employees have helped develop their unit’s outcomes (2014: 70%; 2015: 71%), have participated in assessing their unit’s outcomes (2014: 64%; 2015: 68%), and agree that the assessments for their unit’s outcomes have resulted in improvements to their unit (2014: 48%; 2015: 51%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

Distance Education. The curriculum for classes taught through DE is identical to those taught in the traditional manner, and as such all DE courses have identified learning outcomes and lead to degrees or certificates. Courses taught via DE have identified online delivery requirements and methods of instruction that define regular and effective contact with the instructor (link to blank DE Addendum; DE Guidelines Section 55204). A DE Addendum is attached to the online course outline of record. As part of program review, units assess the effectiveness of distance education courses and the programs to which those courses align. As part of this evaluation, units are given comparative data on student achievement and student learning in the DE and traditional modalities (link to data). Tinberg to run eLumen report on DE courses.

All DE faculty members are required to complete Etudes training, classes in pedagogy, and develop a sample shell, at which point they are approved by the DE Committee to teach DE classes (link to DE Handbook). The DE Committee is comprised of faculty members with a background in DE pedagogy. DE courses are assessed in the same way as traditional courses: faculty create and implement action plans to improve courses, and after implementation the SLO is re-assessed to determine if the action plan was effective. Tinberg to find examples of improvement specific to DE. Ask Mubarakshin to search the unit planning objectives to see if any plan is specific to DE. DE faculty members are evaluated in the same way as traditional faculty.

NOTE: As part of the 2015-16 EPPIC Summary, include a summary of unit planning objectives (# of plans and status by ESMP measure). Then plug this into each appropriate standard (i.e., Tech refresh; prof dev; etc.)

Improvements to DE courses and programs that occurred as a result of ongoing assessment:
- Increased participation of faculty in the DE committee (link to annual assessments)
- Expansion of DE offerings to provide students an alternate method of taking courses (show data)
- Increase in enrollment to meet student demand (show data)
- Comparable success rates between DE and traditional (show data)
- DE Handbook, codification of online pedagogy training, process for evaluation of course design, and requirement for new course shells to be evaluated by DE Committee (DE Handbook)
- Outcomes assessment data (Tinberg to review list of DE sections)

Standard I.B.3.
The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Institution-set standards (See Section II.B. Institution-Set Minimum Standards and Aspirational Targets)
- The College has institution-set standards for college wide student achievement in enrollment, course completion, progression to next course in a sequence of courses, program completion, degree completion, certificate completion, and transfer
- The College has institution-set standards for programmatic student achievement in licensure/certification exam results, and by late fall 2015 will have standards for job placement/post training

Criteria and processes used to set institution-set standards
- The College has defined a process for defining and assessing institution-set standards (Integrated Planning Handbook, link to appropriate process maps in the Appendix: Mission/ESMP, comprehensive and annual program review)
- COMPASS drafted the institution-set standards, which were approved by SPC (link to minutes where this occurred)
- Review of progress towards institution-set standards occurs in COMPASS and SPC (link to agendas/minutes)
- The College assesses how well it is achieving its institution-set standards (See Section II: Student Achievement and Institution-Set Standards)
- Each institution-set standard was established based on a review of historical data (see table below)

Published
- The College’s institution-set standards are published online (link to ESMP Implementation Grid; link to Chart with Standards/Targets)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The ESMP Implementation Grid includes all required institution-set standards, and the College publishes a separate chart that defines standards, indicates how they were determined, and tracks progress towards the standards (link to ESMP Implementation Grid; link to Chart with Standards/Target). (Also see Section II.B: Student Achievement Data and Institution Set Standards.)

The institution-set standards are appropriate for the College to assess whether it is meeting its mission. The College tracks progress towards how well it is serving students from its “diverse communities” through enrollment trends. The College tracks progress towards student attainment of “educational and career goals” through program completion, degree completion, certificate completion, transfer, licensure/certification exam results and job placement/post training.
The College tracks progress towards its “learner-centered pathways” by tracking course completion and progression to next course in a sequence of courses.

At the completion of annual program review, committees with oversight of each ESMP measure review updated data sets (ESMP Data Sets) and relevant unit planning objectives (2014-15 Summary of Program Review Results; 2015-16 Summary of Program Review Results), and design action items towards continued improvement if the College is not meeting the standard (link to sample committee annual assessments).

Starting with the 2015-16 annual program review, units have defined standards for student achievement at the discipline level (link to APR template) in course completion, progression to next course in a sequence of courses (Math, English, and Learning Skills), degree completion, certificate completion, licensure/certification exam results (Dietetics, Law, Nursing, Radiologic Technology, and Dental Technology), and job placement/post training (for CTE departments). A majority of students know how to find information on student success rates for the College and their program (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #31b).

College employees are familiar with the ESMP, which includes the institution set standards (2014: X%; 2015: X%). Presentations on the standards to foster an understanding of priorities and processes to implement strategies have been made regularly, such as at Faculty Symposium (link to 2015 agenda), SPC (link to agenda), Academic Senate (link to agenda), and Days of Dialogue (link to agenda). Standards are documented in the ESMP implementation grid.

The most recent assessment shows that the College is meeting its standards except for transfer, though the College is still waiting for updated data in this area. (See Section II.B.iii: Trends and Interpretation).

The College provides annual reports to the ACCJC (link to reports). As part of this report, the College reviews comparative data on student achievement. This data is identical to the data that committees and units use in comprehensive and annual program review, and in ESMP implementation assessment.

**Distance Education.** The College’s Distance Education Plan includes goals and institution set standards to assess the effectiveness of its DE activities. The Plan requires units offering DE courses to continue to assess quality through program review, including analyzing DE student achievement data in terms of (a) enrollment, (b) course completion, (c) persistence, and (d) progression to next course in a sequence of courses. The expectation is that the standard be the same as for the College as a whole. (Distance Education Plan 2015-2020, p.8.)

**Action Plan.** The College will set institution-set standards for programmatic student achievement in job placement in late fall 2015 and will begin assessing progress in spring 2016.

**Standard I.B.4.**
The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Assessment data use in College planning to improve student learning and achievement

- Data is used to assess the mission, ESMP, and annual priorities (link to Strategic Planning Databook)
- Data is used in comprehensive program review (link to 2012 CPR Data Sets)
- Data is used in annual program review (link to Annual Program Review Data Sets 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16)
- ISLO assessment data is disaggregated and used (see Standard I.B.6.)
- Student achievement is assessed annually (ST1A.4 ESMP; ST1A.5 ESMP Implementation Grid; ST1A.6 Summary of Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards—to be written)
- The integrated planning cycle is designed to focus on student learning and student achievement (ST1A.7 Integrated Planning Handbook—link to pages describing the integrated planning cycle)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Data is used at all stages of the integrated planning cycle. The mission and ESMP are assessed in response to data collected from internal program review and external scans (Strategic Planning Databook). As part of the comprehensive program review, units review data from the past six years, report on outcomes, close out all unit planning objectives, and develop new unit planning objectives for the next six years (CPR Data Sets). As part of the annual program review, units review and analyze data, and revise unit planning objectives or create new planning objectives as necessary (Annual Update Data Sets).

Units use the data collected during the assessment of SLOs and service unit outcomes (SUOs) is to create action plans that will improve student learning and achievement. Then, units implement their action plans and report on the plan’s effectiveness (CSLO Assessment Handbook p. X, PSLO Assessment Handbook, Student Services Assessment Handbook, p.X, Administrative Services Assessment Handbook, p.X). The SLO&A Committee reviews the assessment data (ST1A.3 Latest SLO Report; also include 2013-14 and 2014-15 report).

Student achievement is measured annually in terms of number of certificates and degrees, transfer rates, course completion rates, persistence rates, licensure/exam pass rates of students in CTE programs, employment rates in CTE programs, rates at which first year students enroll in and complete basic skills math and English, and achievement gaps. (ST1A.4; ST1A.5; ST1A.6).
A majority of employees have seen useful data about their unit (2014: 53%; 2015: 58%) and agree their unit uses data for planning, evaluation, and program improvement (2014: 59%; 2015: 67%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

The 2012-13 CPR quantitative and comparative data sets included:

- Enrollment
- Course fill rate
- Class size
- Class success rates
- Degrees awarded
- Certificates awarded
- FTES/FTEF
- % FT faculty
- FLEX completion
- External partnerships
- Student-centered and service-centered units comparative and disaggregated access and success measures in areas relevant to the specific unit

The 2014-15 annual program review quantitative and comparative data sets included:

- Course fill rate
- Class size
- FTES/FTES/WSCH/Standard hours
- Enrollment
- SSSP Progress
- Feeder high schools
- 2014-15 Administrative Survey
- Class success rates
- Degrees awarded
- Certificates awarded
- Disaggregated information on basic skills and learning skills
- Disaggregated student equity data, including disproportionate impact analysis
- Disaggregated Achieving the Dream cohort data

The 2015-16 annual program review quantitative and comparative data sets included:

- Course completion
- Retention rate
- Enrollment
- Number of sections
- WSCH/FTEF
- FT/PT FTEF ratio
- Success rates between DE and traditional sections
- Success rates by age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and/or cohort group
- Number of Math and English assessments, orientations, student educational plans
• Student-centered and service-centered units comparative and disaggregated access and success measures in areas relevant to the specific unit
• LACC Campus Climate Survey results
• District student survey results
• LACC Admin Services survey results
• Degree completion
• Certificate completion
• Licensure/certification exam results
• Job placement/post training rate
• Learning and service unit outcomes progress report

Professional development towards improved use of data
• Informal trainings with the Research Analyst for committee chairs and others responsible for using SharePoint
• Formal SharePoint trainings
• Student Equity Plan Institute: use of data for facilitating discussions and monitoring progress towards closing the equity gap
• Program review trainings on how to use data to create, validate, and monitor progress towards unit planning objectives
• Use of Flex obligation data and survey results to design activities

SPC created to have oversight of ESMP data measures use for analysis and improvement of programs and services (SPC operating agreement)
• Committees that oversee ESMP objectives use the results of program review, along with a review of campus wide data, to generate recommendations towards the goal of continuous improvement of student learning and achievement (committee annual assessments)
  o COMPASS created to serve as the institutional data team (COMPASS operating agreement)
  o EPPIC created to review unit level student achievement data compiled for and assessed in program review (EPPIC operating agreement)

Data used in College level analysis
• The mission statement and ESMP are updated every six years using a comprehensive set of data including college profiles, student access and achievement, analysis of previous planning outcomes, external, and internal scans, which ensure that the mission and ESMP is linked to the needs of our student population (2013 Strategic Planning Databook)
• The College uses data collected from internal program review and external scans to assess the ESMP, which includes the institution-set standards. Committees with oversight of ESMP goals and objectives provide or revise institutional actions or strategies based on data analysis, and identify resource needs with anticipated costs (2008-2013 Strategic Plan; 2014-2020 ESMP; 2014-2020 ESMP Implementation Grid)
• The integrated planning cycle ensures that ESMP objectives and annual priorities inform unit planning and resource allocation (ST1A.7 Integrated Planning Handbook —link to “Onion”)

• Student Equity Plan compares our intended student population with the students we actually serve (Equity Plan access data; local community vs. student population).

• The College has analyzed and is addressing disproportionate impact through the goals of the Equity Plan (link to Equity Plan).

Data used in Unit level analysis

• In annual and comprehensive program review, units use an analysis of data to create unit planning objectives (All results are stored in SharePoint program review site)

• Student achievement is assessed through comprehensive program review and annual updates in terms of awards, persistence, basic skills completion, transfer, course completion, and achievement gaps (ST1A.4 ESMP; ST1A.5 ESMP Implementation Grid; ST1A.6 Summary of Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards—to be written)

  o See tables in Standard I.B.3

• Student support services areas review the following data sets as part of program review

  o CPR data specific to service centered units (2012-13 CPR Service Centered Units)

  o CPR data specific to student centered units (2012-13 CPR Student Centered Units)

  o Annual program review data sets (ESMP Data Sets 2014-15): Report of new and at-risk students receiving services; SSSP completion; applicants and assessment by feeder high school; high schools attended by first-time LACC students; student equity disproportionate impact analysis; Achieving the Dream outcomes

• Administrative services areas use the results of annual surveys to create unit planning objectives

• SLO Annual Reports inform the College of the results of learning outcomes assessments

• EPPIC Program Review Summary Report informs the College of the results of program review

Hiring prioritization process

• The Probationary Faculty Prioritization Policy includes an analysis of data including enrollments, FTES/FTEF ratio, program completion rates, and staffing needs based on size of the department.

Enrollment management

• Review of enrollment trends to design class schedules and optimize use of classrooms (Walden/Emil Mubarakshin to elaborate)

• Continuous tracking of enrollments prior to each semester to inform cancellation of low enrolled classes or open new sections of high demand classes

Use of disaggregated data
Student learning outcomes: The College reviews disaggregated learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender (SLO Annual Report 2015)

Student achievement
- Disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and distance education/traditional students (Student Equity Plan data; comprehensive program review data sets; annual program review data sets)
- Disaggregated data in AtD, Basic Skills, Equity Plan, and student services data (link)
- Through program review, units analyze (link to 2015-16 APR data sets):
  - Success rates between DE and traditional sections
  - Success rates by age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and/or cohort group
- For a list of disaggregated data and how it is used in program review, see Standard I.B.6

As a follow-up to planning agendas identified in the March 2012 Midterm Report, the college has improved on the reporting mechanism for monitoring and improving certificate completions.
- Will Marmolejo to write up summary of how we improved reporting mechanism
- The number of certificates of achievement and skills certificates awarded increased after 2010 and has remained steady since. The 2010 increase was likely due to improvements in the reporting mechanism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Count</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Certificates of Achievement and Skills Certificates Awarded 2008-2015, Sept 2014)

- The College has made efforts to discontinue low-performing certificates. Since 2012, the College has discontinued 17+X certificates. April Pavlik and Thelma Day

Distance Education.
- The College annually reviews data that compares success rates in DE and traditional classes (link to CPR 2012 data; link to APR data/graph presented at most recent COMPASS).
- Starting with the 2015-16 cycle, assessment data collected for DE courses is the same as for traditional courses.
- Units assess disaggregated DE student achievement data in terms of enrollment, course completion, persistence, and progression to next course in a sequence of courses.
- Starting with the 2016-17 cycle, data will include student surveys on support services, as described in the action plan for Standard I.B.7.

Quality Focus Essay Plan. 1.2.1 Produce data to inform recruiting, including student satisfaction, price sensitivity, and academic program demand analysis (see QFE Objective 1.1.4). Additional use of data to target high school students. [Wanner to write this]
Standard I.B.5.
The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Integrated cycle of program review
- Ongoing
  - For a timeline of the ongoing evaluation of programs and services, see Standard I.B.9
- Data on student learning and achievement
  - For a complete list of quantitative and comparative data sets used in program review, see Standard I.B.3.
- Improvement planning
  - The primary outcomes of program review are unit planning objectives (link to 2013-18 unit planning objectives home)
- Implementation
  - As part of program review, units report on actions taken (link to 2013-18 unit planning objectives home)
- Planning to budget
  - As part of program review, units create resource requests to support unit planning objectives (link to resource request form)
  - Resource requests are prioritized in support of ESMP goals and College priorities (link to prioritized lists from 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16)

Student learning outcomes
- All units evaluate how they contribute to the mission through outcomes assessment (Relation of Outcomes Assessment to LACC’s Mission Diagram, CSLO, PSLO, Administrative Services and Student Services Assessment Handbooks, p.3-4)
- Outcomes assessment results and plans are linked to ESMP Goals and Objectives in program review (units program reviews)

Extent of use of institutional data and evidence
- Through program review programs create unit planning objectives to support the measures of the ESMP and review their progress on improving the measures (link to program review analyses and unit planning objectives)

Disaggregation
- Through program review, units analyze (link to 2015-16 APR data sets):
  - Success rates between DE and traditional sections
  - Success rates by age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and/or cohort group
The Results of the College using Program Review

- To inform curriculum planning, including adding or deleting courses (link to latest APR Template)
- To redesign course content, change textbooks, add assignments, and create learning communities (evidence: unit planning objectives; Learning outcomes assessment spreadsheet coming from Tinberg). See Standard II.A.2.
- Revision and/or discontinuance of degree and certificate programs (link to a summary report that lists which ones were discontinued and why—Ruiz to create?)
- Prioritizing resource requests based on the outcomes of program review and on how strongly unit planning objectives support ESMP objectives and College priorities. See Standard I.A.3. (Resource request prioritization lists from previous years)
- Prioritizing faculty hiring. See Standard II.A.16. (link to hiring prioritization process lists from previous years)
- Updating existing unit planning objectives or writing new unit planning objectives in support of the ESMP, which includes goals and objectives to improve student achievement, learning, support services, and institutional processes. (link to online system)
- ESMP oversight committees using the EPPIC Program Review Summary to generate action plans for College level improvement (EPPIC Program Review Summary 2014-15 and 2015-16; SharePoint site with Committee Plans to Support ESMP)
- As a component of viability studies (link to EPPIC Viability Template)

Analysis and Evaluation:

[Consider writing a complete summary of how program review works here. Then hyperlink to this section anywhere else in the document where we describe program review.]

Board Rules (Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article XIII, 6801) clarify the purposes of program review and that program review “shall link the college’s mission with the educational master plan, and department goals, and educational objectives.” LACC accomplishes this through its integrated planning cycle. The ESMP defines the College’s goals, objectives, and measures, and a program’s unit planning objectives are designed to support ESMP objectives towards fulfillment of the mission and the College’s commitment to student success.

Departments and units in all campus divisions (Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services) engage in program review. LACC has a definition for a “program” (Integrated Planning Handbook, Glossary of Terms) and has identified which programs must participate in annual program review (Integrated Planning Handbook, Appendix D). The College has defined program review as the process by which it uses quantitative and qualitative data to assess and evaluate the performance of its programs, resulting in unit planning in alignment with the goals of the ESMP, and resource requests to support those plans. A comprehensive program review is conducted every six years, and updates occur annually. The results of program review inform college-level planning. (Integrated Planning Handbook, ‘Program Review’ section).
In Comprehensive Program Review (CPR), programs review data from the past six years, report on outcomes, close out all unit planning objectives, and develop new unit planning objectives for the next six years. Data includes analysis of the mission, SLO maps, curriculum, strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/challenges, trends and industry standards, external/programmatic requirements, and long-term needs. The resulting planning objectives can only originate from (a) annual ESMP priorities, (b) other college plans, (c) learning outcomes assessment results, (d) past program review recommendations, or (e) accreditation requirements, viability recommendations, and specific college external/programmatic requirements (Shared Governance Council Recommendation #14, September 10, 2012).

In annual program review, programs review and analyze data, and revise unit planning objectives or create new planning objectives as necessary. Programs are expected to work collaboratively to report on quantitative and qualitative data, including (a) progress towards institutional priorities by analyzing comparative data sets, (b) previous year learning outcomes assessment activities, (c) a strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/challenges analysis, and (d) compliance with previous program review requirements and validation team recommendations.

A majority of employees are familiar with LACC’s program review process (2014: 62%; 2015: 67%) and have participated in their unit’s program review process (2014: 56%; 2015: 62%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015). A majority of employees agree that the program review process for their unit has resulted in improvements to their unit (2014: 43%; 2015: 51%) and agree the outcomes of their unit’s most recent program review has helped improve student learning/services (2014: 43%; 2015: 58%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

Employees agree that their unit helps to achieve the LACC Strategic Plan (2014: 65%; 2015: 69%). Employees are familiar with their unit’s annual goals (2014: 50%; 2015: 60%), agree that their unit’s annual goals help to prioritize their efforts within (2014: 53%; 2015: 59%), and agree that their unit reviews the accomplishment of its annual goals (2014: 53%; 2015: 58%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

Student learning and service unit outcomes assessment is a process the college uses to assess how we are accomplishing our mission (Relation of Outcomes Assessment to Fulfilling LACC’s Mission Diagram link). Each program outcome, be it for an instructional program or for a learning support service needs to align with an ESMP goal and an objective. Consequently, when program outcomes are assessed and that data is used to make decisions on how a unit can improve, the college advances its accomplishment of its goals and objectives. (CSLO Assessment Handbook, p. x-x; PSLO Assessment Handbook pp. 3-4; Student Services Handbook on Assessment, p. 3-4). For more on this, see Standard I.A.2. During program review, units may use outcomes assessment data to create unit planning objectives that are aligned with an ESMP goal and objective (examples of units program reviews).

For a list of disaggregated data and how it is used in program review, see Standard I.B.6.

Since the 2012 Midterm Report there have been important changes to and outcomes from the program review process over the past few years include:
• Requirement that unit planning objectives align with ESMP measures, ensuring that planning efforts align with College priorities
• Requirement that learning/service outcomes assessment results are used for unit planning objectives
• Administrative Services required to participate
• Increase in number of programs that are required to engage in program review (*Barbara Macz to do: count this for the past few years*)
• Increase in unit planning objectives (205 in 2013-14, 273 in 2014-15; add 2015-16 #s once available)
• Increase in unit planning objectives completed (0% in 2013-14\(^2\) to 10% in 2014-15) and in progress (21% in 2013-14 to 38% in 2014-15) (link to EPPIC APR Summary 2014-15 and the 2015-16 to be written)
• Move from biennial updates to annual updates to support continuous dialogue and development of unit planning objectives
• Online templates and comparative data sets ensure continuity and transparency
• Participatory governance structure revised to clarify responsibilities and support more focused dialogue (New Model for Governance)
• Adding curriculum planning to the program review template (as of 2015-16)

**Distance Education.** Planning, approval, evaluation, and review of courses offered in DE occur as part of the College’s overall integrated planning process.

- **Planning.** As a result of ongoing planning efforts and increased awareness of external mandates, departments and divisions are thinking more strategically about how to increase their DE offerings. Units create DE planning objectives that are aligned with the ESMP. As part of program review, units submit resource requests to support their unit planning objectives, which may include requests relating to supporting DE. Planning at the College level is set in the DE Plan, which includes measurable objectives.

- **Approval.** The LACC DE Committee has a stringent approval process for requests to teach courses by distance methods (*DE Handbook*). Although decisions about which courses to take forward to the Curriculum Committee for approval are made by departments and divisions based on their own criteria and procedures, the DE committee expects DE courses to support college priorities. As part of the curriculum approval process, the DE Addendum includes a justification for DE courses. The expectation is that an online course will make participation possible for students who experience geographic and time barriers in gaining access to higher education. The course must draw on individual learning styles to help students become more versatile learners, and must be appropriate for a collaborative learning environment.

---

\(^2\) Prior to the 2012-13 Comprehensive Program Review, units were asked to either complete, discontinue, or renew all existing plans as new unit planning objectives ( Comprehensive Program Review @City A Guide to the 2012-13 Process).
In summer 2015, for example, 20 courses were developed utilizing Title 5 funds to ensure that a degree would be available through DE. Courses were selected based on whether they were UC/CSU transferable and if they would support an online degree.

- **Evaluation and review.** At the unit level, DE courses are evaluated through the comprehensive and annual program review process, including learning outcomes assessments. Evaluation occurs in the same way as for traditional courses. At the College level, DE access and success rates are reviewed annually through the ESMP implementation grid and through the DE Committee’s annual assessment of the DE Plan. For example, the College reviewed DE vs. traditional comparative data as part of the as part of the 2013 Distance Education Substantive Change request submitted to the ACCJC to approve 29 degrees and 12 certificates that students have the opportunity to complete 50% or more of required courses toward through online instruction. Similarly, success rates in DE/traditional courses were assessed as part of the 2012-13 comprehensive program review. The 2015-16 annual program review required units to review comparative data on their DE courses. Assessment of DE courses/sections

**Action Plan.** In spring 2016 the College will hire a research analyst with a familiarity with running focus groups and developing qualitative surveys.

**Standard I.B.6.**

_The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal, and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies._

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Disaggregation of learning outcomes

- The College analyzes disaggregated learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender for ISLOs
- Evidence of dialogue
- 2015-16 SLO Annual Report

Disaggregation of student achievement

- The College analyzes student achievement by subpopulations as part of comprehensive program review and annual program review, and through its Student Equity, Basic Skills, and Achieving the Dream plans (link)
- Disaggregated data
  - Disproportionate impact analysis for ESL and Math basic skills (2014)
  - In course success by ethnicity (2007-2012, from 2012 CPR)
  - DE vs. traditional by discipline (2012 CPR; 2015 APR)
  - Percent evening vs. weekend by discipline (2012 CPR)
- Veteran Student Achievement (2008-2010)
- Time to complete degree by discipline (2009-2014)

Identification of gaps and implementation of strategies [add evidence after each of these]

- Through program review and the integrated planning cycle, units use an analysis of learning outcomes and student achievement to develop unit planning objectives
  - 2015-16 SLO Annual Report
  - 2014-15 EPPIC Program Review Summary and 2015-16 EPPIC Program Review Summary
- Units request funds to support their unit planning objectives, which are prioritized based on alignment with College priorities (link to prioritization rubric)
- EPPIC Summary Report of all action plans generated from program review, by department
- Student Equity Plan (link to action plans in the report with outcomes)
- Basic Skills Plan (link to action plans in the report with outcomes)
- Achieving the Dream Plan (link to action plans in the report with outcomes)
- The College analyzes student achievement by age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and distance education/traditional students (Student Equity Plan data; comprehensive program review data sets; annual program review data sets)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Learning outcomes
Starting with the Spring 2015 data load, the College began using eLumen to disaggregate learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender (SLO Performance Report for ISLOs—C Tinberg to create). At that point, units were able to develop and implement strategies to mitigate performance gaps.

Student achievement
Since the college’s involvement with the Achieving the Dream Initiative (AtD) in 2010, disaggregated data review of the student population, in terms of race/ethnicity and gender, has been used to assess the college’s overall access and success rates. Such practices of disaggregated data analysis have been further employed in the ESMP measures as part of evaluating goals and objectives and developing, implementing, and evaluating activities as ways of improvement. Moreover, in the college’s Basic Skills End-of-Year reports and the Student Equity Plan, disaggregated data of student success are analyzed in the committee structure to develop and implement proposed activities throughout the college and yearly evaluation of updated data is used to determine the effectiveness of those activities.
For instance, AtD interventions relied on disaggregated data analyses from the data team (now COMPASS) of the campus to inform the core team (now, SPC) to develop and implement activities to improve success rates of subpopulations identified as “disproportionally impacted” in terms of equity. In 2013-2014, the core team came up with four initiatives to address low success rates of subpopulations of the student body.

- Engaged College Initiative
- Front Door Initiative
- K-12 Partnership
- Completion Pathway Reform

One of the strategies for Completion Pathway Reform was a taskforce to look into development of a program specifically for African American students, like an UMOJA program, that would help improve the degree/certificate completion rates of that subpopulation of the student body, the data about which showed a low success rate. That activity, now as part of the 2014-2015 Student Equity Plan, is currently being funded to provide counseling services for those disproportionately impacted.

The college also relied on disaggregated data of subpopulations for its yearly reporting of the Student Equity Plan. The Equity Plan requires:
- Disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, age, disabled, and economic disadvantaged, in terms of:
  - Course completion
  - Math and English/ESL basic skills completion
  - Transfer
  - Degree completion
  - Certificate completion

The Equity Plan further required the college to review its student population in the foster care program and the veterans program. With the analysis of the data, the college approved of strategies that directly provides services to these groups with the outcome of reducing the inequity gap by 2020. Similar measures on these subpopulations are used in the ESMP. Evaluation of the activities, based on disaggregated data, are done yearly for updated reports to the college and the state.

**Distance Education.** As part of the DE Plan 2015-2020, the College will analyze DE student achievement data in terms of (a) enrollment, (b) course completion, and (c) retention. As part of this review, the College will look at disaggregated DE student achievement data to review disproportionate impact in DE courses based on gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and cohort group. The institution set standards for student achievement and disproportionate impact are the same as for the College as a whole. As part of 2015-16 annual program review, units analyzed disaggregated achievement measures, including a comparison of success rates between DE and traditional sections, and semester comparison of success rates by age, gender,
race/ethnicity, disability, and/or cohort group. [Ruiz to write up summary once it is done]. The comparison was done based on the institution set standards for student achievement and disproportionate impact set by the College as a whole.

**Action Plans**

- The College will use disaggregated learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender for PSLOs starting with an assessment of spring 2015 data
- By fall 2016 the College will research ways to use disaggregated learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender at the course level
- By fall 2016 the College will research a way for communication between eLumen and our student information system.
- By fall 2016 the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will create a data timeline for systematic annual creation and analysis of data, identifying specific committees and outcomes

**Standard I.B.7.**

*The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Processes used to assess the integrated planning cycle

- Governance committees are responsible for updating documents that outline policies and procedures (*Annual Assessment Template*)
- Governance committees have clearly defined roles in developing policies and practices (*Integrated Planning Handbook*)
- *At the unit level, program review allows us to evaluate ‘practices.’*
  - As an example, discuss the low-performing degrees/certs and the action plans we’ve taken as a result
- *Another example of this is the writing of the ESMP, which included a review of program review processes, governance structure, oversight committees*

Effectiveness of planning in fostering improvement

- [see below; cut and paste evidence here]

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

A number of new committees, policies, and procedures have been created since the last site visit in 2008. *As a result of the last comprehensive evaluation of the College during the 2008 ACCJC site visit, the College made these changes: accreditation compliance: Integrated Planning Handbook, etc....list them here...summarize from the chart at the end of this document*
These include the creation of the Accreditation Team to ensure compliance with all ACCJC standards and policies, a faculty hiring prioritization committee and process (HPC), a committee supporting the student success goals of the ESMP (COMPASS), a committee providing oversight of the SSSP Plan (SSSP), the merging of the Bond Steering Committee and the Facilities Planning Committee to oversee the Facilities Master Plan, and an institutional effectiveness taskforce to review of processes for updating the catalog and maintain the integrity of the website.

The most significant change to procedures occurred through A New Model for Governance (A New Model for Governance), which was adopted in spring 2013. The model, which approved by mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and the President, clarified committee responsibilities and reporting, more clearly aligned student success efforts with institutional planning, and helped ensure that faculty, staff, students, and administrators worked cooperatively to make recommendation on policies and processes towards student success. A number of elements of the governance structure were clarified, including the creation of the following committees:

- College Council, which assumed the responsibility of the Shared Governance Council, to make recommendations to President on institution-wide processes
- Strategic Planning Committee, which assumed the responsibilities of the Shared Governance Council Planning Committee and Student Success Committee, to make recommendations to promote student success at the college level
- Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee, which assumed the responsibility of the Educational Planning Committee and Program Review Committee, to make recommendations to promote student success at the unit level

Committees involved with student success such as COMPASS, EPPIC, and SPC use student achievement and outcomes data. This data is communicated to committees and the public through annual reports from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and through the six-year strategic planning databook at the start of each new program review cycle. The College has expanded its use of SharePoint as the primary way to document governance committee activities and outcomes and to share data with the campus.

The Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook, written in 2013 and approved in spring 2014 is an important publication that clarifies the College’s governance and integrated planning cycle (link). Approved by the President of LACC on recommendation of the College Council and the Academic Senate, the document describes the program review, planning, and budget development processes. The handbook was vetted by all major College governance committees and will be reviewed by the SPC at least every three years to assure integrity and effectiveness.

A number of important changes occurred as a result of the clarification of the College’s integrated planning cycle:

- Combining the Educational Master Plan and Strategic Master Plan into a single six-year Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) to avoid duplication of efforts in college planning
Developing of an annual timeline to better align the program review, unit planning, and resource allocation processes, and to make oversight committees aware of when they need to complete their responsibilities (link to 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 timelines)

A better understanding of the alignment of unit and college planning. Oversight committees use the results of the EPPIC Program Review Summary, which includes summaries of unit planning objectives and updates to access and success measures, to consider recommendations for action at the campus level to improve student success

Assigning specific committees responsibility for oversight of ESMP objectives

Reinforcing the use of data for evaluation and reevaluation

Defining of the types of data units use to create unit planning objectives and associated resource requests, including both quantitative data (ESMP access and success measures) and qualitative data (strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/challenges, learning outcomes assessment discussions)

Requiring that all unit planning objectives align with ESMP measures

Requiring that all unit planning objectives can only be created in response to ESMP annual priorities; college plans; learning outcomes assessment results, program review recommendations; or accreditation requirements, viability recommendations, and specific college external/programmatic requirements

Recognizing that the College needs to create a classified hiring committee to parallel the processes of prioritization done by the faculty hiring committee

Clearly describing how the College is “closing the loop” on using the results of the evaluation of its programs and services

Committees are responsible for updating other key College processes. For example, the Program Review and Effectiveness Committee (PRE) organizes, implements, and validates the program review process for all campus programs. The committee works to improve the processes and forms used in program review, and planning to budget, based on recommendations from EPPIC through its Program Review Summary. Similarly, the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee produces an Annual SLO Report that includes suggestions for improvements to the outcomes assessment processes and an evaluation of improvements that have occurred in all campus units as a result of outcomes assessments.

[Still need to do this? Maybe not....Summarize committee annual assessments from the past few years in the following areas:

- Instructional programs
- Student and learning support services
- Resource management
- Governance processes]

Distance Education. The DE Committee writes an annual assessment, which includes a review of changes to processes, policies, and practices that occurred in the previous year. DE processes are articulated in the DE Handbook, which undergoes revisions in the DE Committee that are vetted in appropriate participatory governance committees.
**Action Plan.** The Distance Education Committee will create pre, during, and post student surveys to assess whether students utilize our DE support services. The committee will create the survey in spring 2016 and implement in fall 2016.

**Standard I.B.8.**
*The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Mechanisms for participation in and communication about planning and evaluation

- The primary way that the College broadly engages in assessment results is through the program review process. Unit outcomes are “rolled up” to College outcomes, allowing us to set institutional priorities.
- The College uses its participatory governance structure to share assessment and evaluation results with the campus (*Integrated Planning Handbook page with the governance flowchart*)
- The College uses SharePoint as its primary way of documenting committee outcomes (*link*)
- The participatory governance Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) develops College priorities (*ESMP, ESMP Annual Priorities*)
- SPC writes an annual ESMP Progress Report (*link*)
- The participatory governance Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee (EPPIC) summarizes comprehensive and annual program review outcomes (*link*)
- The College prioritizes resource requests based on alignment with ESMP priorities (*link to Budget prioritization rubric*)
- The Annual SLO Report is shared with various governance committees, Student Services Council, and ASG (*link to minutes, link to reports*)
- The SLO SharePoint website, which is accessible to the public, includes assessments results and reports for the institution, and each academic, administrative, and service unit (*links*)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College uses its participatory governance structure to disseminate information to the campus. Committees post all information disseminated at meetings on their SharePoint websites, which are publicly accessible. Documentation includes agendas, minutes, reports, presentations, annual assessments, and handouts with relevant data.
At the college wide level, progress reports are written as a result of reviews of all college plans including institutional learning outcomes assessments and analysis of measures and targets. Committees and subcommittees with responsibility for ESMP objectives periodically review the ESMP Implementation Grid and provide progress reports to the Strategic Planning Committee. Committees and subcommittees with appropriate oversight of supporting plans and strategies assess and evaluate progress, which is summarized in each committee’s annual assessment reports. Annual assessments are reviewed, validated, and shared in appropriate committees, with the forwarding of all results to Strategic Planning Committee. The Strategic Planning Committee compiles an annual ESMP Progress Report that is shared at Academic Senate and College Council.

At the unit level, EPPIC provides an annual program review summary report that is shared with appropriate committees and used by ESMP oversight committees to consider recommendations for action at the campus level. An annual summary of learning outcomes assessments is written by the SLO&A.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides frequent reports that are shared with the instructional departments and services areas to inform them of progress made as a campus and by individual units. All data used in the comprehensive and annual program review process is available on SharePoint and accessible by the campus.

The College uses updated data sets to develop annual ESMP priorities, which reflect the weaknesses of the College. The current priorities are to ensure that students build early momentum towards success by accessing key programs, courses, and services in their first year of enrollment; increase the number of first time college students who enroll directly from local
feeder high schools; increase the number of students who successfully achieve their academic and career goals; improve the rate at which students complete basic skills English and Math; and increase equity in student outcomes. Through its planning to budget process, the College prioritizes resource requests based on how well they support these ESMP annual priorities.

The College’s SLO SharePoint website is a publically accessible source for communicating assessment results and reports for all college units (Student Learning Outcomes Home). For administrative units, results collected between 20xx-2013 are listed by unit, organized by year (Administrative Service Units). For 2014-15, all unit results are reported on one document (link). For student service units, assessment activities and results from 2009-2014 are listed by unit, organized by year (Student Services Units). Also, every unit’s results are compiled onto one document, the Student Services-All Units-Assessment Reports, organized by year (Student Services Resources). All academic unit results are listed by unit, organized by year - get name of eLumen report I will use (Academic Affairs Departments, two report examples for courses, two for programs). Name of historical reports and new reports ISLO results are available, too (ISLOs). The website is also a repository for the SLO Committee’s activities and reports, the Student Services SLO Workgroup minutes, and presentations the SLO Campus Coordinator delivered to the campus (ISLO, other presentations about results. Our SLO Guide for Students website links directly to the SLO Home page (SLO Guide For Students).

All of the College’s outcomes assessment activity is communicated in the SLO&A Committee’s SLO Annual Report (link to reports). The report is shared with various governance committees, Student Services Council, and ASG (link to minutes). One intention of the report is to recommend to appropriate constituencies how assessment results could be used for institutional planning. But, in 2013-14 the report did not include any such recommendations. One reason was because the Committee found too many weaknesses of process within each division. For example, in student services, though the units collected a good quantity of data was collected in most cases the assessment methodologies did not directly address the outcomes. Therefore, assessment findings lacked validity. The second reason was that our assessment software, eLumen, was so filled with “bugs” when it released its new version that our assessment activity was minimized. CSLOs cores could not be entered in a timely manner and our completed curriculum maps did transfer. So, we lacked sufficient CSLO data to gain valid insights and we were prevented from assessing our ISLOs since our maps were wiped out (link to report, pages where I talk bout eLumen). In our 2014-15 report ….

The SLO SharePoint website is a publically accessible source for communicating assessment results and reports for all college units (link to home page). ISLO, PSLO, and course-level data is accessible to the public. The website is also a repository for the SLO Committee’s activities and reports, the Student Services SLO Workgroup minutes, and presentations the SLO Campus Coordinator delivered to the campus (ISLO, other presentations about results. We also have a SLO Guide for Students website (SLO website for students).

**Standard I.B.9.**
The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional
effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Mechanisms to gather evidence about the effectiveness of programs and services

- The College engages in a continuous, broad based, and systematic integrated planning cycle (Integrated Planning Handbook appropriate pages)
- The four phases of the integrated planning cycle (Plan-Act-Assess/Evaluate-Use Results) includes program review and planning, which leads to resource allocation (Integrated Planning Handbook appropriate pages)
- The college and unit level components of the integrated planning cycle allow the College to assess how well it is accomplishing its ESMP, which defines institutional effectiveness and academic quality (Integrated Planning Handbook appropriate pages)
- Student/Service Learning Outcomes Assessment is integrated into the College’s program review, planning, and resource allocation processes
  - Relation of Outcomes Assessment to Fulfilling LACC’s Mission Diagram
- Institutional planning at college and unit levels is both short and long term
- All campus divisions (Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services) engage in program review
  - 2012-14 Validated Academic Affairs Comprehensive Program Reviews
  - 2012-14 Validated Student Services Comprehensive Program Reviews
  - 2012-14 Validated Administrative Services Comprehensive Program Reviews
  - 2014-15 Validated Program Reviews
- All campus divisions participate in college level planning
  - 2013-2018 Unit Planning Objectives
- Resources are allocated based on how well they support College priorities
  - 2014 Resource Request Review
  - 2015 Resource Request Review
- The College has supporting plans that include an assessment of previous plans and outline long-term action plans
  - Distance Education Plan
  - Staff and Organizational Development Plan
  - Technology Resources Plan

Improvements to programs and services
- [see below and cut and paste here]

Analysis and Evaluation:

LACC’s mission and ESMP align with the District mission and strategic plan. LACC accomplishes its mission by implementing action plans to support the goals and objectives of its ESMP. The ESMP guides all other college plans, strategies, and learning outcomes, and forms
the basis for the program review process. The process of continuous quality improvement is achieved through the stages of the integrated planning cycle.

1. Assess and Evaluate Plans and Units & 2. College and Unit Planning
In these stages, college wide and unit assessment, evaluation, and planning takes place. Course and program SLO assessment and SUO assessment occurs, which leads to units creating unit planning objectives in program review (link to slo diagram). In the college review, committees assess and evaluate college plans and strategies using data collected from internal program reviews (EPPIC Program Review Summary) and external scans. They “close the loop” by using the results of the assessment and evaluation to update college plans and create annual priorities. Through program review, units assess and evaluate unit planning objectives using data collected from the results of comprehensive program review, annual program reviews, ESMP annual priorities, and learning outcome assessments and then “close the loop” by using the results for further planning and to develop supporting resource requests.

3. Planning to Budget
This stage includes the prioritizing and allocating of resources towards the implementation of the ESMP. Budget prioritization includes the prioritizing of classified hiring, faculty hiring, and additional resource requests, and the allocating of operating budgets based on ESMP annual priorities, the EPPIC Program Review Summary, and approved unit planning objectives.

4. Plan Implementation
In this stage, units implement their unit planning objectives using allocated resources, and committees with oversight of college plans implement their strategies.

Program review at LACC is sustained and substantive, as the college continues to use institutional effectiveness to improve and update its programs and services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Biennial program review (review and update of the comprehensive review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Start to use eLumen for learning outcomes assessments; has been used ever since</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Comprehensive (6-year) program review completed by academic programs, student services and administrative services using online system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Biennial program review process revised into a series of online modules, including a review and update of the comprehensive review recommendations and goals/action items. SGC Program Review Subcommittee created. [In this 2009 follow-up review, five recommendations were given, in which Recommendation 4 (data use and analysis) was implemented with the CPR.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fall 2010 | • Planning module (for funding priorities for 2011-12)  
• Success module  
• First 30% SLO implementation follow-up module |
| Winter 2011 | AUP module |
| Spring 2011 | Second 40% SLO assessments due (March 15)  
Accreditation midterm report preparation |
| Summer 2011 | Accreditation midterm report preparation |
| Fall 2011 | • Schedule narrative module for those courses that do not satisfy three criteria for offering a course  
• Accreditation midterm report preparation  
• Planning module (for funding priorities for 2012-13)  
• Success module  
• Second 40% SLO implementation follow-up module  
• Final 30% SLO assessments due (December) |
| Winter 2012 | AUP module |
| Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 schedule creation using planning from EMT |
| Spring 2012 | • Accreditation midterm report on 5 recommendations and 21 planning agendas  
• Final 30% SLO implementation follow-up module  
• Development of the Comprehensive Program Review process |
| Summer 2012 | • CPR workshops  
• Strategic Master Plan working groups |
| Fall 2012 | • Planning module  
• Success module  
• Comprehensive Program Review begins  
• 100% of SLO assessments and implementation follow-up reports complete  
• Spring 2013 schedule creation using planning from EMT  
• Requirement for units to write a Five Year Plan for program outcomes assessment |
| Winter 2013 | • New SMP written  
• Annual unit plan module |
| Spring 2013 | • Fall 2013 schedule creation using planning from EMT |
• 2012-13 CPR validation

Fall 2013
• Revision of 2012-13 CPR unit planning
• Spring 2014 schedule creation using planning from EMT
• Revision to shared governance process and creation of College Council, and SPC, and EPPIC
• Requirement for units to write a Five Year Plan for course outcomes assessment

Spring 2014
• Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) vetted and approved through the participatory governance process
• Resource request process aligned with program review results
• EPPIC validation of 2013-14 CPR results

Fall 2014
• ESMP implementation grid vetted and approved through the participatory governance process
• Annual program review update
• Spring 2015 schedule creation using planning from EMT

Spring 2015
• Resource request process aligned with program review results
• EPPIC validation of 2014-15 CPR results

Fall 2015
• Annual program review update

Important changes to the program review process over the past few years include:
• Administrative Services required to participate starting in 2008
• Move from biennial updates to annual updates to support continuous dialogue
• Requirement that learning/service outcomes assessment results are used for unit improvement planning
• Requirement that unit planning objectives align with ESMP measures
• Online templates ensure continuity and transparency
• Participatory governance structure revised in 2013 to clarify responsibilities and support more focused dialogue

The College continually assesses, via institutional effectiveness, progress towards completion of its ESMP and supporting plans. For example,
• the College used the results of its assessment of progress towards completion of the previous Strategic Master Plan to write the 2014-20 ESMP (see Strategic Planning Databook: 2012-13 Strategic Master Plan Progress Assessment Report; Inventory of Unit Goals (and Status) by Strategic Master Plan Objective and Action);
• The College also completed four out of six distance education strategies in support of the 2008-2013 Strategic Master Plan, with the remaining two (establishment of a distance education degree, certificate programs, and transfer program) included as part of the 2014-2020 ESMP (evidence: DE Plan);
• The College completed 17 of 26 staff and organizational development action items in support of the 2008-2013 Strategic Master Plan, with one discontinued and eight in progress as part of the current ESMP and/or Staff and Organizational Development Plan 1;
The College completed four of five staff and organizational development action plans in support of the 2009-14 LACC Technology Plan, with one discontinue;

The College also completed all given action plans in response to the 2009 ACCJC Recommendation. (Evidence: S&OD Plan);

The College completed 18/26 of its 2009-14 technology objectives, with two in progress and two discontinued; 4 still need to be reviewed (Pamela, Juan) (Evidence: Technology Resources Plan).

Employees participate in the writing of annual goals (2014: 48%; 2015: 50%) and agree that their unit has received funding based on its annuals goals (2014: 31%; 2015: 43%). Employees are becoming more familiar with the campus-wide planning process and how it drives LACC’s budgeting of resources (2014: 42%; 2015: 51%) and the process for submitting a format request for funds (2014: 52%; 2015: 55%). (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

Distance Education. Starting with the 2015-16 cycle, assessment data collected for DE courses is the same as for traditional courses. Units assess disaggregated DE student achievement data in terms of enrollment, course completion, persistence, and progression to next course in a sequence of courses. Starting with the 2016-17 cycle, data will include student surveys on support services, as described in the action plan for Standard I.B.7. Question for Tinberg: can we pull out learning outcomes assessments results for DE courses separately from traditional courses?

Complete the summary report of all the improvements made in 2014-15 and 2015-16; pull out some examples of good improvements and then say "for a complete list see XXX"

Quality Focus Essay Plans. In order to better meet enrollment targets the College will:

- Develop a Strategic Marketing Plan by summer 2016 (QFE Objective 1.1)
- Revise and expand its Enrollment Management Plan by 2018-19 (QFE 1.2)
- Complete all planning activities towards implementation of its SSSP Plan (QFE 1.4)

[Wanner to finish this]
**Standard I.C. Institutional Integrity**

**Standard I.C.1.**
The institution assures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Information about the mission, learning outcomes, programs, and services

- The mission statement is printed in the catalog (link) and schedule of classes (p.i), and is posted online (link)
- The College has a process for assessing and updating the mission statement (*Integrated Planning*)
- Educational programs are listed online and printed in the catalog (*link to website and pages*)
- Student Support Services are listed online and printed in the catalog (*link to website and pages*)
- PSLOs for each degree and certificate appear on each department or program website (*Business Administration, Child Development*) and on each department’s page in the catalog (Administration of Justice pp. 43-46, Electronics pp.87-89).
- Two websites, with one specifically for students, provides SLO listings and results, (*Student Learning Outcomes Home, SLO Guide for Students*). The website, Student Learning Outcomes Guide for Students, tells students where to find the CSLOs and PSLOs (*SLO Guide for Students FAQs*)
- CSLOs, identical to those on the approved course outlines, are included on every course syllabus, which are updated each semester as appropriate.
- Outcomes for student support services appear on each unit’s website (*Office of Student Life, TRiO*)

Information about accreditation status

- The accreditation co-chairs ensure that the required language on accreditation status is in the Catalog (ST1A.2 College Catalog, p.7) and on the website one click away from the homepage (link)
- Programs with independent accreditation (Nursing, Radiologic Technology, Dental Technology) list their accreditation status on their websites (link to each)

Regular review of publications

- The College has an Institutional Integrity Committee, under the guidance of the Accreditation Team, to ensure clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information in the catalog and website. The committee has developed a formal process for updating the catalog and website. (*link to Inst Int operating agreement and Inst Int Handbook*)
Information about student achievement

- [Link to student achievement data online: Scorecard, institution set standards, CPR and APR data, etc.—this is somewhere else in the Self Eval…find it and put it here or say to see that Section]

Student recruitment

- Recruitment is done by the Office of Student Recruitment, including well-qualified officers and volunteers whose credentials, purposes, and positions are clearly specified (link to website once it’s done—Terri Anderson)
- Outreach Training Manual, 2015, used for training for faculty, staff, student ambassadors, career guidance counseling assistants (Terri Anderson: to be digitized and put online)
- Awards of Foundation scholarships are offered only on the basis of specific criteria related to merit or financial need (Catalog, p. 17; LACC Foundation Website)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Our catalog, schedule of classes, and our website are the primary ways we provide information to the students and the public.

The catalog was last updated in August 2015, the result of six months of comparing and reconciling the CCCCO list, District PRAP list, and the catalog. Unofficial programs were removed from the catalog, and the District was made aware of programs they needed to include in their PRAP list (evidence: Thelma has email trail documenting the changes). The end result is that the official list of programs offered at LACC is now in the 2015 catalog.

The Institutional Integrity committee was formed in October 2014. The committee formalized a process to ensure that the catalog was the primary source of information regarding the mission statement, educational programs, learning outcomes, and student support services, and to ensure that the website reflects any changes to this information. The formal operating agreement was written and approved in early fall 2015 (link).

Student and service learning outcomes are made available to students and the public through a variety of means. Degree and certificate PSLOs appear on each department’s website Art and Art History, Photography and on each department’s page in the catalog (Business Administration pp. 49-58, Child Development pp. 64-70). CSLOs, identical to those on the approved course outlines, are included on every course syllabus. Outcomes for student support services appear on each unit’s website EOP&S, Office of Special Services. Two websites, with one specifically for students, provides SLO listings and results (Student Learning Outcomes Home, SLO Guide for Students).

The Outreach Training Manual includes policies and procedures for student ambassadors and career guidance counseling assistants, as well as information on the high school registration process, how to conduct a tour of the campus; and information on all student support services, CTE programs, and academic degree programs.
Once it is complete, add information from the “Institutional Integrity Manual”

Although only 58% of students are familiar with the College mission statement, 76% are aware of the institutional learning outcomes of the College, 78% are aware of learning outcomes for their program, and 88% are aware of the learning outcomes for their courses (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #32a, #32b, #32d).

**Distance Education.** The College website advertises DE courses separately ([Fall 2015 DE Course Schedule; Summer 2015 DE Course Schedule](#)). The website includes a separate page with information for DE students, with resources including the online library catalog, electronic book catalog, access to databases, 24/7 online reference assistance, link to the online Bookstore, and online counseling and academic advisement ([DE Webpage](#)). The information on the DE website is the responsibility of the DE Committee and the Institutional Integrity Committee ([link to operating agreements](#)). The effectiveness of this information in reaching potential students in DE programs is reflected in the increased enrollment in DE courses over the past few years and the development of new online courses. Online enrollments grew from 206 (0.2% of total enrollment) in 2000-01 to 7,778 (7.5% of total enrollment) in 2011-12 (Appendix A). The College successfully offered 26 DE courses in fall 2007, 40 in fall 2008, 62 in fall 2009, and 81 in fall 2010 ([Online Teaching: Courses Taught, Semester, Number of Sections](#)). In the fall 2012 semester the College offered 104 online courses. Most LACC online students reside within its service area and concurrently enroll in on-campus classes to increase the number of units they can take each semester to complete their degree and transfer requirements ([Traditional/DE College Profile, p. 2](#)). Mubarakshin: PROVIDE MORE RECENT DATA FROM PREVIOUS SEMESTERS DONE In DE Section above

ADD DATA FROM THE MOST RECENT DISTRICT STUDENT SURVEY

Add results of DE questions from the 2015 campus climate survey

In program review the College uses disaggregated data to compare success rates in DE and traditional courses ([2012 CPR DE-Traditional Success Rates; 2014 Update to be run by Emil and included in 2015-16 APR](#)). Results of program review are posted online at the College website and accessible to all ([link to program review website](#)).

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** 1.1.2 Update the College website, 1.1.3 Define and promote points of pride and areas of distinction, 1.1.4 Promote signature and under-enrolled academic programs, 1.1.5 Increase marketing to feeder high schools. More clearly market programs to increase enrollments

Measure: Increase participation rates to 25%. More effectively utilize student recruitment services to increase enrollments

[Wanner to write this]
Standard I.C.2.
The institution provides a print or online catalog for students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the “Catalog Requirements.”

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The LACC catalog includes all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the ACCJC “Catalog Requirements:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Catalog Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Name, Address, Telephone Number, and Website Address of the Institution</td>
<td>p.iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Mission</td>
<td>p.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of accredited status with ACCJC, and with programmatic accreditors if any</td>
<td>p.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course, Program, and Degree Offerings</td>
<td>pp.32-97 as part of each department/program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>p. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes for Certificates and Degrees</td>
<td>pp.43-134, examples p. 68, 94, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Calendar and Program Length</td>
<td>p.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom Statement</td>
<td>p.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>pp. 219-220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Learning Resources</td>
<td>Library: p.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bookstore: p.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialty services and programs for targeted students: pp.218-227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty</td>
<td>pp. 228-248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of Governing Board Members</td>
<td>p.ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions requirements</td>
<td>pp.10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition, Fees, and Other Financial Obligations</td>
<td>pp.14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer requirements</td>
<td>pp.22-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty</td>
<td>p.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination</td>
<td>p.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance and Transfer of Credits</td>
<td>Credit by exam: pp.213-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit for courses at non-accredited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The catalog is provided in both print and electronic formats ([link to online version](#)).
- All specialized programs with selection processes include detailed information on their department websites: Child Development/Dietetics Program, Dental Technology, Radiologic Technology, Nursing Program, Theater Academy

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Students and prospective students always have access to the most recent catalog, available online. The catalog includes all the facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the “Catalog Requirements.”

A limited amount of print versions are made and are accessible to the public in the Library, all student services offices, Admissions, Financial Aid, and in each academic department. The electronic version of the Catalog for the upcoming year is posted to the website in August.

The College follows an approved process to ensure that the information in the Catalog is accurate, current, and detailed ([link to Institutional Integrity Manual](#)). A designated academic dean oversees the annual Catalog update process. Student Services units and the Curriculum Chair edit the wrap pages. Managers sign off on any changes. Department chairs are given time to edit their departmental pages, with edits verified by the department chair, curriculum dean, VP Academic Senate (curriculum chair), and curriculum secretary. The curriculum dean updates pages listing administrators, department chairs, and faculty. Department chairs review and provide updates. The list of administrators is reviewed at a management meeting. An overwhelming majority of students (88%) think the Catalog provides accurate information on the College, its programs, and policies ([LACCD Student Survey Results 2015](#), #23e).

**Distance Education.** Distance Education students can access information on academic freedom, student financial aid, and available learning resources in the online version of the Catalog. Additional information is provided at the DE website, including links to the online library catalog, electronic book catalog, access to databases, 24/7 online reference assistance, online bookstore, and online counseling and academic advisement ([DE Webpage](#)). A webpage specific
for DE students provides links and information on additional student resources (DE Students Page). Financial Aid services including the FAFSA application can be completed online (link to link on our website). If a student is unable to come in person to the Financial Aid office to verify their income or provide proof of residency, the student is contacted to provide such documentation by mail, email, or fax. The current catalog describes the instructional delivery applied in DE courses and the interaction between faculty and students and the accessibility of faculty and staff to students (link to Catalog page with “LACC Distance Education Learning”).

**Standard I.C.3.**
The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

**Student learning assessment data**

- CSLO, PSLO, and ISLO assessment data/reports are collected for each unit and accessible to faculty, staff, students and the public (link to assessment reports on sharepoint)
- Student service units collect data on SLOs which is accessible to faculty, staff, students and the public (Assessment reports by unit, by year)
- The SLO Guide for Students website has a link directing students to SLO SharePoint website so they can view results (slo guide website)
- Presentations on SLO results (Senate minutes – ISLOs, others?)
- SLO Annual Reports (SLO Committee Product link)

**Evaluation of Student Achievement**

- Data published on the college website:
  - ARCC data and other Scorecards (link to faculty/staff major landing page, and “for students” page)
  - College Profile (Office of Research website)
  - CPR data sets and analysis (Program Review website)
  - ESMP data updates (SPC website)
- Evaluation of the data:
  - Comprehensive program review evaluation framework (link)
  - Unit planning objectives (link)
- Institution-set standards are included as part of the ESMP (ESMP implementation grid)
- Sharing of data at appropriate committees (find minutes of committees that have responsibility of ESMP measures; OIE presentations on student achievement data; explanation given to Board of Trustees institutional effectiveness committee on low-performing certificates)
- The participatory governance procedures and reporting structure was improved through A New Model for Governance (A New Model for Governance), adopted in spring 2013
• Annual institutional effectiveness reports submitted to Board of Trustees institutional effectiveness committee (link)
• Annual ARCC sign-off by the Board of Trustees before submission to the state per Student Success Act (SB1725) (link)
• Disaggregated data presented in AtD, Basic Skills, Equity Plan, and student services data (link)
• Documented assessments posted online:
  o Committee assessments
  o AtD, Student Equity, SSPP planning
• Student learning and student achievement is communicated to the unit and College constituencies through the measures established in comprehensive program review and annual program review updates (link to 2013 CPR data and 2014 and 2015 updates)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College collects student learning assessment data for its instructional programs and its student support services programs. For instructional programs, course and program level SLO reports can be run in eLumen and downloaded by faculty teaching within that program (give examples). Each semester, the Campus SLO Coordinator runs an eLumen report for each department showing assessment results for all courses assessed that term, then posts it on the SLO SharePoint website, organized by unit, then by year (Academic Affairs Departments, name of eLumen report – give 2 examples).

Annually, the assessment results for instructional and student services programs are downloaded and posted, as well (links). The SLO Committee uses these reports to analyze assessment results campus-wide in preparation for writing the Annual SLO Report. The SLO SharePoint website and its contents are publicly accessible. If students find the SLO Guide for Student website first, instructions and a link directs them to the main SLO SharePoint site to view assessment data and analyses (links).

• Students have increased awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs through the creation of the Student Learning Outcomes Guide for Students website (link to website; student survey results—find relevant #s)

The College’s SLO SharePoint website is a publically accessible source for communicating assessment results and reports for all college units (Student Learning Outcomes Home). For administrative units, results collected between 20xx-2013 are listed by unit, organized by year (Administrative Service Units). For 2014-15, all unit results are reported on one document (link). For student service units, assessment activities and results from 2009-2014 are listed by unit, organized by year (Student Services Units). Also, every unit’s results are compiled onto one document, the Student Services-All Units-Assessment Reports, organized by year (Student Services Resources). ISLO results are available, too (ISLOs). The website is also a repository for the SLO Committee’s activities and reports, the Student Services SLO Workgroup minutes, and presentations the SLO Campus Coordinator delivered to the campus (ISLO, other
presentations about results. Our SLO Guide for Students website links directly to the SLO Home page (SLO Guide For Students).

Student achievement data is published annually on the college website. Data is evaluated using a framework that was established through comprehensive program review with the setting of standards in 15 measures. Results of the framework are communicated to low-performing units, which are asked to create unit planning objectives that are recorded and publicly available online. Institution-set standards are established through the ESMP and implemented through the program review and committee oversight process. Committees document their review of data through minutes and annual assessments. (link)

Student achievement data is shared with appropriate committees and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness makes regular presentations on student achievement data, including to the Board of Trustees. Committees overseeing Achieving the Dream, Basic Skills Plan, SSSP, and Equity Plan review disaggregated data to assess their planning efforts. (link)

The spring 2013 reorganization of the participatory governance structure was in part done to clarify committee use of data. For example, COMPASS is now responsible for using college level data and EPPIC is responsible for using unit/program level data. (link) Although only 65% of students know how to find information on student success rates for the College and their program (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #31b), the College will provide additional links to student success data on the “For Students” web page.

Action Plan. By spring 2016 the College will add links to student success data on the “Students” page of the website.

The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Information about programs
- Each certificate and degree is listed in the catalog (ST1A.2 College Catalog, pp.25-27—get new page #s) and on the college website (Degrees and Certificates on the College website)
- Each certificate and degree is described on the department’s website (Art & Graphic Design, Physics & Engineering) and in the catalog (link, 2 examples), including PSLOs, required and elective courses and the number of units.

Verification that students receive a course syllabus that includes student learning outcomes
- Tinberg

Verification that individual sections of courses adhere to the course learning outcomes
- All sections of a course assess with a common CSLO, task, and rubric (CSLO Assessment Handbook, p.x-x)
- SLO Course Coordinator organizes the assessment efforts of all faculty that teach a section(s) of a particular course (Course Coordinator Responsibilities)
- Course Coordinators are assigned that role in eLumen (Screenshot of courses page)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The catalog, schedule of classes, and college website includes a description of the purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes for all certificates and degrees (links). Learning outcomes for all degrees and certificates are on all department web pages.

Each course has a designated Course Coordinator, who could be either an adjunct or full-time faculty member that teaches that particular course. It is this person’s job to organize the assessment efforts of all faculty that teach a section of the course. Working collaboratively, faculty meet to develop a common SLO, assessment task, and rubric. The Course Coordinator is assigned that specific “role” in eLumen, which allows he/she to track the assessment activities for each section of that course. The Coordinator can view which SLO was assessed, confirm that the correct rubric was used, see how many students were scored, and the results. In this way, we are able to monitor that individual sections of a course adhere to the commonly developed SLOs, tasks, and rubrics.

Distance Education. Although the College does not offer any degree or certificate 100% online, students can access information about programs through the College catalog and website. [This may change by the end of this semester. Title 5 curriculum outcomes (20 new courses). Once those are approved, we will be able to offer an entire degree online. Check with April Pavlik that this is true. Make a note that this is going to be part of the QFE.]

Students taking DE courses receive a syllabus and must accept in the LMS that they have received the syllabus before they can continue with the course (link to “syllabus activity meter” in any sample DE course shell since winter 2014). Faculty members are required by Board Rule to provide students and the Department Chair a syllabus that includes “the approved course student learning outcomes” (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article VII, 6705.20). The College verifies that DE sections adhere to stated course objectives and learning outcomes through comprehensive and basic evaluations, during which teaching skills are assessed through required classroom observations and student evaluations (AFT Contract, Article 19.G.4; Article 42.C.6). The evaluation reviews whether the faculty member “disseminates course syllabi” (AFT Contract, p. 189). Learning outcomes and course objectives are stated in course outlines of record, and faculty evaluation ensures that the instructor “teaches course content that is appropriate to the official course outline of record congruent with standards set by the discipline”(AFT Contract, p. 191).

Action Plan. The College will do a thorough assessment of whether the website accurately reflects what is in the catalog, in alignment with the Institutional Effectiveness Handbook.
Standard I.C.5.
The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Processes used to evaluate policies, procedures, and publications to ensure integrity

- The College reviews its policies and procedures through committee annual assessments (link). Give this some more thought...
- The single document that guides all description of programs, services, and the mission is the college catalog, which undergoes significant review each year
- The College has a process to ensure clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information in the catalog and how that information gets onto the website (link to document once it is developed)
- The Institutional Integrity committee oversees ensuring the accuracy of all information published to the public. (link to Institutional Integrity committee operating agreement)
- In late summer, the catalog undergoes a review before publication where the chairs, deans, and curriculum chair review the prospective catalog and make appropriate notes. (link to institutional integrity manual)
- Also describe Ed Code requirements (?)

How communicated with the College community

- Campus wide dialogue about how to better increase communication amongst committees to ensure accuracy of information on campus and to the public (Days of Dialogue minutes)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Oversight of policies, procedures, and publications takes place within the College’s committee structure. Committees write annual assessments that document major action items and recommendations made in support of the ESMP, and whether the committee needs to change any aspect of its operations. Annual assessments are reviewed and approved within the governance structure.

The College has an Institutional Integrity committee, with the guidance of the Accreditation Team, to ensure clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information in the catalog and website. The committee has developed a formal process for updating the catalog as well as the website (link to Institutional Integrity Handbook). The catalog is updated annually through dialogue with department chairs, coordinators such as curriculum, supervising deans, and Vice-Presidents to ensure all information is accurate.

Action Plan. The College will complete a Continuous Improvement Plan that describes how key integrated planning processes and activities are reviewed, evaluated, and assessed. The Continuous Improvement Plan elaborates on the processes described in the Integrated Planning Handbook and is intended to guide institutional effectiveness and continuous quality
improvement. The plan will describe categories and components of the continuous improvement processes, the cycle of evaluation of those processes, and how the processes are aligned with ESMP goals. The plan will be completed and vetted through the governance structure in spring 2016.

**Standard I.C.6.**

*The institution accurately informs current and prospective students regarding the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks, and other instructional materials.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Total cost of education

- The College follows all federal guidelines regarding disclosure of cost of education, such as, tuition and fees charged to full-time and part-time students, estimates of costs for books and supplies, room and board, transportation costs for students and any additional cost of a program in which a student is enrolled or expresses an interest
- The Consumer Information & Student Right-To-Know site contains links to required federal and state disclosures including cost of education and financial assistance information.
- The catalog lists tuition and fees (ST1A.2 College Catalog, p.14)
- The catalog includes a “cost of education” chart with itemization (ST1A.2 College Catalog, pp.15-16; “Determining Financial Need”)
- The College website lists tuition and fees (Tuition and Fees)
- The College website provides a link to a net price calculator including an estimated cost of books and supplies (Net Price Calculator)
- During orientation, students are told about fees (New Student Orientation)
- The cost of textbooks is available online at the LACC Bookstore web page. Students can choose the term and course and see the cost of the required books (link to Bookstore website).
- Instructional materials for those courses that have required lab fees or other fees are listed in the schedule of classes, which is printed and available online (show examples in the schedule of classes)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Information on tuition and fees is updated annually and published in the catalog. Information on cost of textbooks is available at the online LACC Bookstore website. Information on those classes that have instructional materials is listed in the schedule of classes, which is also available online. The net price calculator will total the cost of tuition, fees, instructional costs, as well as the estimated personal expenses and transportations. It also calculates Room and Board and estimated grant aid.
The college catalog includes information on how students can determine financial need including an estimate of cost of education for students living at home and living independently (Catalog, pp.15-16).

To Do: Villar or Peter Anzeline: We should move the net cost price calculator to For Students page under Apply and Register.

Distance Education

**Standard I.C.7.**

*In order to assure institutional and academic integrity, the institution uses and publishes governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituencies, including faculty and students.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees policies on academic freedom (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter XV, 15002), non-censorship of lecturers and speakers at student sponsored events (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter IX, Article X, 91004.12), and freedom of speech (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter IX, Article IX) are available online
  - Peter Anzeline: *Add links to academic freedom on the website to the “for students” page*
- The College publishes its policy on standards of students conduct (Catalog “Standards of Student Conduct” p.223)
- The College website has a summary of prohibited discrimination and harassment, including information on academic freedom ([link](#))
- *Alan should write a report that analyzes statistics of complaints.*
- The college has an academic freedom statement in the Senate Bylaws (?), and faculty who feel that their right is infringed upon can work through either the senate leadership to resolve the issue or if it is verified that the contract was violated, the faculty member will work with the union.
- The senate has a standing committee, the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom committee, which is charged with establishing, reviewing, and publicizing policies and guidelines, regulating the ethical conduct of faculty and issues of academic freedom.
  - Senate has restarted the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom committee ([link to operating agreement](#))

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Board policies make clear that LACC is committed to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and supports an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituencies. The policy on academic freedom recognizes that during the course of an
education some opinions and ideas may cause some students discomfort, but recognizes that academic freedom will not allow prohibited discrimination. The policy defines academic freedom as including the faculty’s right to teach and the student’s right to learn. (link) The policy on freedom of speech defines the use of free speech areas. (link) The campus has a designated free speech area between Clausen and Franklin Hall at the main entrance on Vermont Avenue.

The faculty contract says that faculty shall have the academic freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning to the students (AFT Contract, p.3). As part of faculty evaluations, students are asked if the instructor interacted with them in ways that were free of discrimination, and if the instructor created an environment where it was safe to express opinion that differ from the faculty member (AFT Contract, p.220).

The standard of student conduct states that students have the freedom to learn and will be given appropriate conditions and opportunities in the classroom and on the campus. Students are encouraged to develop critical judgment, search for truth; and exercise their rights to free inquiry and free speech in a responsible manner. (College Catalog, p.223)

**Distance Education.** DE courses are evaluated in the same manner as traditional courses, including faculty evaluations and student evaluations. DE students are able to access College policies on academic freedom and responsibility through the College catalog and website.

**Action Plan.** By spring 2016 the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom committee will create a Handbook.

**Standard I.C.8.**

*The institution establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity. These policies apply to all constituencies and include specifics relative to each, including student behavior, academic honesty, and the consequences for dishonesty.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

How the College informs and enforces its policies on academic honesty for students and faculty

- Policies on academic honesty for students are listed in the Catalog: find page # (Thelma Day)
- Policies on academic honesty for faculty?
- A statement on academic dishonesty and student conduct is included in each syllabus
- College office that enforces academic honesty for students? For faculty?

Board policies on student academic honesty

- The District has policies in place that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter IX, Article VIII)
- The President of the College publicizes the Standards of Conduct each semester (link)
- Board Rules define student behavior (9803), academic dishonesty (9803.28), and the consequences for violation of these rules and regulations (9803.11)
College policies and procedures for handling student complaints

- E-55 admin regulation: [http://www.laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/E-55.pdf](http://www.laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/E-55.pdf)
- LACC Catalog in 2014-15: Student Grievance Procedures (p. 225)
- Process for filing complaints and grievances is posted online (Student Complaint Procedures)
- Statement of Grievance (E-55 Form 1)
- Request for Formal Grievance Hearing (E-55 Form 2)
- E-55 flowchart ([Alen Andriassian to get this online](http://www.laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/E-55.pdf))
- Financial Aid and Student Services complaints may be filed using their respective forms ([Consumer Information & Student Right to Know](http://www.laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/E-55.pdf))

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

LACCD Board Rules, which are accessible online, cover the conduct of students, college personnel, associated student government members, and visitors to LACC (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter IX, Article VIII, 9801). Per Board rule, the president publicizes the Standards of Conduct (9803) each semester. Board Rule Standards of Conduct state that “all persons” shall respect and obey civil and criminal law and obey the rules, regulations and policies of the Los Angeles Community College District. The Board rules include definitions of student behavior including willful disobedience (9803.10), disruption of classes (9803.15), theft (9803.16), and discriminatory behavior (9803.21); as well as academic dishonesty (9803.28) and the consequences for violation of these rules and regulations (9803.11). The Board has a clearly outlined policy on student discipline (Chapter IX Article XI, 91101), including definitions of types of disciplinary actions and the process for disciplinary hearings.

The College catalog reprints all Board Rules regarding student behavior, student academic integrity, and consequences for integrity violations (Catalog, pp.223-224). The catalog also includes description of examples of violations of academic integrity (Catalog, p. 224). This information is also printed in the schedule of classes. Both the catalog and schedule of classes are available online. In addition, all syllabi are required to include a statement on the student code of conduct and academic dishonesty. ([Link to Board Rules: Chapter VI.ArticleVII.6703.10](http://www.laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/E-55.pdf))

The President of the College publicizes the Standards of Conduct each semester (link). The Fall 2013, Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 Academic Newsletters requested that faculty place the Board statement on student honesty on their syllabi. The Academic Senate’s Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee crafted the LACC statement on faculty ethics ([Faculty Ethics](http://www.laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/E-55.pdf)).

An overwhelming majority of students (91%) think the policies and penalties for cheating are clear and enforced (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #23d)

**Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions**
[WORK ON THIS WITH ALEN Andriassian —MAKE SURE YOU ADDRESS ALL THE POINTS LISTED IN THE “POLICIES ON STUDENT COMPLAINTS”]

Student Grievance Procedures are printed in the Catalog (p. XX) and follows District Administrative Regulation E-55, #9i. Alen Andriassian will look into the status of our files for the last 6 years; needs to ensure that discipline files are separate from grievance files. Team will have access to all our files; we should meet this standard. Also check that Dental Tech, Rad Tech, etc. have contact information to their accrediting bodies on their websites.

***The grievance procedure does NOT apply to the following. **Need to follow up on all of these with Alen Andriassian and Jeremy Villar...

a. Challenge process for prerequisites, corequisites, advisories and limitations on enrollment. Information on challenges to prerequisites is available from the Office of Academic Affairs.

b. Alleged violations of sexual harassment, actions dealing with alleged discrimination on the basis of ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, color, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability. These complaints are handled through the Compliance Office.

c. An appeal for residency determination. Residency appeals should be filed with the Admissions and Records Office.

d. Eligibility, disqualification or reinstatement of financial aid. Procedures for eligibility, disqualification or reinstatement of Financial Aid may be obtained in the Financial Aid Office. Student financial aid claims: usually handled informally through the Office of Financial Aid, through an explanation of written federal regulations (link to District Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy).

e. Student Discipline: Actions dealing with student discipline are handled through the Office of Student Services.

f. Freedom of the Press: Issues pertaining to freedom of press and journalism are addressed in Administrative Regulation E-63 and Board Rules 9703 and 9704.

g. Employee Discipline. Students may file complaints about employee conduct with the appropriate administrator (see Board Rule 10101 -- Unsolicited Written Derogatory Communications).

h. Challenges of established District policies, e.g. Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. Grievances regarding District policy, which are beyond the authority of a college president, shall be referred to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee for appropriate handling and response.

i. Financial claims against the District. Financial claims need to be made through the District’s Office of General Counsel.

See Catalog p. 4 for harassment policy. Compliance officer see p. 239.

Process—write this out in sentences

Student meets with ombudsperson. Sometimes handled informally. Sometimes student decides to fill out initial E-55 (form 1).

1. Respondent has a chance to answer the grievance in writing

2. Grievance committee (faculty, administrator, student) convenes. Student (or student advocate if the student wants it) and respondent present their case at grievance hearing.
Committee decides if there is in fact a grievance and if so a second meeting is held and recommendation is forwarded to the college president.

Documentation:
- Ombudsperson keeps written notes on initial meeting with student. E-55 is kept on file. Respondent response is kept on file. Recommendation is documented on the E-55 forms. Records kept in a locked room in a filing cabinet in the ombudsperson’s office.

**Distance Education.** The College has a policy for authenticating and verifying that the student who registers in a distance education course is the same student who participates in and completes the course (DE Handbook, p.20). Student verification procedures are built into the Etudes LMS as it is directly linked to our SIS system. This ensures that only students who are enrolled in the campus have access to the LMS. Online training courses required for all DE faculty emphasize unique and individualized assessments to ensure student verification (*link to @One*).

LACC follows the LACCD authentication process by authenticating and verifying that the student who registers in a distance education course is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit (34 C.F.R. § 602.17.) through the use of one or more of these methods: (a) Secure credentialing/login and password, or (b) Students access distance education courses using their unique ID and password, or (c) proctored examinations (DE Handbook, p.20).

Faculty members are required to provide students and the Department Chair a syllabus that includes “a reference to the student code of conduct as it relates to academic dishonesty” (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article VII, 6705.20). Students taking DE courses receive a syllabus and must accept in the LMS that they have received the syllabus before they can continue with the course (link to “syllabus activity meter” in any sample DE course shell since winter 2014).

**Standard I.C.9.**
*Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Communication of expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline
- Board Academic Freedom Policy (Board Rule 15002, from the Prohibited Discrimination Policy)
- Faculty must follow the official course outline of record regarding what topics are covered in a class (*Title 5 section 55002(a)(4)*)
- The Academic Senate has a statement of professional ethics that requires faculty to hold professionally accepted views in a discipline and teach fairly and objectively (*Academic Senate Statement on Professional Ethics*).
• Code of Ethics, generally: http://www.laccd.edu/Board/Documents/BoardRules/ChI-ArticleII.pdf
• Articles 4 and 5 from the faculty collective bargaining agreement (link)

How evaluated
• The faculty evaluation process ensures faculty follow the course outline of record (Basic and Comprehensive Evaluation Summary Form For All Faculty, AFT Contract, statements #9,10,11, p.195; Student Evaluation of Classroom Instructor, AFT Contract, statements #12,13, p.218)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Faculty members must follow the course outline of record regarding the topics covered in a class (Title 5 section 55002(a)(4)). The evaluation process for classroom faculty asks whether the faculty member “ensures that course content is current and appropriate,” “teachers course content that is appropriate to the official course outline of record congruent with standards set by the discipline,” and “uses materials that are accurate and that are pertinent to the subject matter and course outline” (Basic and Comprehensive Evaluation Summary Form For All Faculty, AFT Contract, statements #9,10,11, p.195). Student evaluations include questions on whether “the instruction relates to the course objectives,” and if the faculty member “creates an environment in which it is safe to seek help, ask questions, or express opinions, which differ from those of the faculty member” and if “the instructor is knowledgeable in the subject area” (Student Evaluation of Classroom Instructor, AFT Contract, statements #12, 13, p.218). Faculty members are required by Board Rule to provide students and the Department Chair a syllabus that includes “the approved course student learning outcomes” (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article VII, 6705.20). The course outline of record defines the content, methodologies, outcomes, and assessment for all courses, which are validated through the curriculum process. Employees agree that they use teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs of their students (2014: 85%; 2015: 88%). Similarly, employees agree that they have experience in a variety of pedagogical approaches to teaching and serving student needs in different ways (2014: 77%; 2015: 84%; 2014-15 Comparative LACC Campus Climate Survey).

Among the many ethical expectations of the faculty described in the Academic Senate’s statement of professional ethics, faculty members are expected to be responsible for “developing and improving their scholarly competence,” pursuing “intellectual honesty,” and holding “the best scholarly standards of their discipline” (Academic Senate Statement on Professional Ethics). An overwhelming majority of students (90%) agree that instructors present information fairly and objectively and distinguish between personal convictions and professionally accepted views (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #23g).

Distance Education:

Standard I.C.10.
Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty and student handbooks.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Not applicable

Analysis and Evaluation:

As a public, open-access community college, LACC does not promote specific beliefs or worldviews. There are no specific codes of conduct for faculty, staff, students, and administrators outside of standards of behavior indicated in the catalog and AFT contract.

**Standard I.C.11.**

*Institutions operating in foreign locations operate in conformity with the Standards and applicable Commission policies for all students. Institutions must have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Not applicable

Analysis and Evaluation:

LACC has no instructional sites out of state or outside the United States, and has not requested authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.

**Distance Education.** The college does not promote DE in foreign locations. The College does not enroll non-US citizens who do not reside in the US.

**Standard I.C.12.**

*The institution agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure, institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. When directed to act by the Commission, the institution responds to meet requirements within a time period set by the Commission. It discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Accuracy of communication of matters of educational quality and institutional effectiveness to the public

- LACC complies with eligibility requirements (Self Evaluation, Section V, pp.x)
- LACC complies with accreditation standards (Self Evaluation, Section VII, pp.x)
• LACC complies with the commission policy on public disclosure and representation of accredited status (Self Evaluation, Section VI.3, pp.x)
• LACC submits institutional reports as required
• LACC submitted substantive change requests as appropriate for distance education and the addition of new AA-T degrees

Analysis and Evaluation:

Since its last Self Evaluation, LACC has submitted and received approval for all required reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Report Submitted to ACCJC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Self Study, Self Study Update, Annual Report, Annual Fiscal Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Annual Report, Annual Fiscal Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Annual Report, Annual Fiscal Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The campus also publishes student success information and institutional effectiveness measures on its website to be available to the public and prospective students. The information is updated each year to remain accurate.

**Standard I.C.13.**

*The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies, including compliance with regulations and statutes. It describes itself in consistent terms to all of its accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Communication with external agencies

• LACC submits reports to the following external agencies:
  o Annual performance and final performance reports to EOPS, TRIO, Financial Aid, Perkins, Title 5, CalWORKS
  o Annual Nursing, Dental Technology, Radiologic Technology, and Child Development accreditation reports
  o [others?]
• The accredited status of LACC is posted online, one click away from the main page (Accredited Status)
• The status of the following programs that are accredited by external agencies is posted on website of each department [provide links below to the web page stating the accred status of each program]
  o Radiologic Technology provides annual reports and have site visits periodically. The accreditation awards can be from 1, 3, 5, and 8 years in duration. The annual reports can be made available as well. [link]
  o Law provides reports every three years and has site visits every six years. The self-reports are available to upload online and the feedback from site visits can be made available as well. [link]
  o Psychology provides reports every several years and this information can be made available to include feedback. [link]
  o Dietetics provides annual reports and this information can be made available with feedback. [link]
  o Nursing provides annual reports and receives a comprehensive report on all colleges. [link]
  o Dental Technology is similar to Rad Tech. [link]

Response to recommendations, cited issues, citations
• Walden?? add this

Evidence of compliance with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) regulations
• Walden?? add this

Collect department external accreditation reports and put them online; put a link to their commission online—Alex Davis

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Introduction (p.x) lists the programs that are accredited by external agencies. Reports submitted to those agencies are posted online at the department website (Alex Davis to check on this). The College has consistently been active and open to accrediting body recommendations and has successfully gone from Probation to Fully Accredited in two years (link to old 2008 Accred report). The campus has demonstrated that it reports its status clearly and honestly to the public, and the campus is open to adapting to the recommendations of accrediting bodies.

The institution ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount to other objectives such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Education is paramount to other objectives
• LACC does not generate financial returns for investors, contribute to a related or parent organization, or have supporting external interests (link to LACC Financial Statements from 2009-2015...Anil Jain to get these at the District website...)

Institutional priorities
• The ESMP is primary planning document that clearly outlines the campus’ priorities for each six-year period, all of which are designed to facilitate the mission of the college. (link to ESMP)

Analysis and Evaluation:

LACC ensures its commitment to high quality education, student achievement, and student learning through its mission, ESMP, and program review process. The College does not generate financial returns for investors, contribute to a related or parent organization, or support external interests. The College is a non-profit, state-funded, teaching organization with no emphasis on research or private scholarship. The campus is defined solely by its mission to provide the highest quality education possible.
Standard II
Student Learning Programs and Support Services

The institution offers instructional programs, library and learning support services, and student support services aligned with its mission. The institution’s programs are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate for higher education. The institution assesses its educational quality through methods accepted in higher education, makes the results of its assessments available to the public, and uses the results to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional programs and student and learning support services offered in the name of the institution.

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

Standard II.A.1. All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution’s mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

How the College ensures that all course and program offerings align with the mission

- LACC’s mission is to provide students opportunities for transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills programs (Mission)
- All instructional programs have mission statements that are aligned with the LACC mission (2012 CPR, I.A, p.1)
- The College has a definition for instructional program (Integrated Planning Handbook Glossary)
- All instructional programs must relate to College mission (NewProgramRequestEPPIC)
- All courses must be a requirement or elective of existing instructional programs (Course Outline of Record, Section III)

How the College chooses the fields of study in which it offers programs

- A program is only approved once there is demonstrable need for the program and that it meets the stated goals and objectives in the region the College proposes to serve with the program (NewProgramRequestEPPIC)
  Ask Mardeza Salinas to create a folder with all the PNPRs submitted and a summary document of which ones were approved in the past 6 years
Evidence that students complete degrees and certificates, gain employment, and transfer

- CPR, 2014, and 2015 update – Degrees (link)
- CPR, 2014, and 2015 update – Certificates (link)
- CPR, 2014, and 2015 update – Transfer (link)

How the College evaluates student progress and outcomes

- ESMP implementation grid (describe the access and success objectives, including transfers, degrees, course completions, certs, etc.)
- Program review, learning outcomes assessments, unit planning objectives

How the College assesses programs for currency, appropriateness in higher education, teaching and learning strategies, and student learning outcomes

- Currency and appropriateness are assessed through program review and viability study processes (describe below)
- Teaching and learning strategies are assessed through PSLO assessments (PSLO Assessment Handbook, p. 14, Senate Assessment Policy Resolution)

Distance education programs

- No degrees are awarded 100% through DE—see above; April Pavlik to check if this will still be true once new curriculum is approved
- The DE Plan includes an objective to create a degree—talk about it below—describe how all campus constituencies reviewed the Plan.
- Any new distance education program would be approved through the traditional process including a PNPR and approvals in EPPIC, Curriculum Committee, and Academic Senate

Analysis and Evaluation:

As part of the 2012 Comprehensive Program Review, instructional programs were asked to revise their departmental mission to align with the mission of the college (2012 CPR, I.A, p.1). These mission statements were validated during the CPR validation process and approved by the Curriculum Committee (find Curriculum minutes showing approval of unit mission statements in 2011/12).

The program approval process requires that all transfer programs include the preparation of students for one or more specific baccalaureate majors or areas of study, and that courses required in the program must be transferable to prepare students for an area of study or to fulfill the lower division requirements of a major at four-year colleges. Local approval begins with the EPPIC Application for Initiation of a New Degree or Certificate, which includes questions that ensure that the classes/program align with the mission and are appropriate to higher education, including Criteria A (#1,2,3) and Guiding Questions #1 (NewProgramRequestEPPIC). After initial approval, the department completes the District Proposed New Program Request (PNPR),
which corresponds to the State Chancellor’s Office form CCC-501: Application for New Credit Program. Programs are vetted at the Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate, and final approval occurs with the State Chancellor’s Office (State Chancellor’s Office List of Approved Programs).

All instructional programs have PSLOs and follow a five-year assessment plan that identifies at least one PSLO to be assessed each year (link to plans, senate resolution). All programs have assessed at least one PSLO (links). The majority of students (78%) are aware of learning outcomes for their program and agree (88%) that the courses required in their program prepare them for further coursework, employment, or transfer (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #32c, #32e).

The course approval process begins with the course outline of record, which includes a question Althat asks “whether the course meet the ‘standards for approval’ for degree credit course set forth in Title 5, section 55002(a)(2), which requires the course to have a degree of intensity, difficulty, and vocabulary that the curriculum committee has determined to be at the college level” (link to Course Outline of Record, Section V, #7).

Instructional programs result in student achievement of degrees or certificates, which is tracked through the program review cycle. As part of program review, units assess their degrees (CPR 2014 update – Degrees link) and certificates (CPR 2014 update – Certificates link) and develop planning objectives to increase their production. The College does not track transfer rates by department, as students do not identify as majors. (Effective fall 2016, all students who have completed a minimum of 15 units must declare a major for further priority consideration.) The College tracks employment rates for those vocational departments that have external accrediting agencies: Dental Technology, Radiologic Technology, Nursing, Dietetics, and Law.

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** 1.2.3 Develop and support an online AA degree that a cohort of students can complete in two years. Expanded program that will culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs.

[Wanner to write this]

**Standard II.A.2.**

Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:
How faculty determine what delivery modes are appropriate for students

- Course content and methods of instruction are defined in the official course outline (link to blank Course Outline of Record, Section II, #1)
- Quote some information from the DE Plan and DE Handbook—Guerrero

Faculty discussion about relation between teaching methodologies and student performance

- Faculty members determine teaching methodologies in the course outline of record (link to COR, Section II, #1).
- Faculty are required to follow the official course outline of record that outlines the content and methods of instruction for all classes (Title 5 section 55002(a)(4))
- All course outlines of record are written by the department and discussed and approved through the curriculum process, including tech review, Curriculum Committee, and Academic Senate
- Analysis of success rates in DE vs. traditional courses (CPR, 2015 annual program review)
- Occurs during SLO assessment (Assessment Handbook, see guiding questions, get some examples from action plans – ESL?, spreadsheet)

Criteria in program review

- Faculty members participate and consistently engage in program review annually. (For detailed information on the program review process, see Standard I.B.3.)

Data for program review

- For the data used in program review, see Standard I.B.4).
  Find an appropriate place to list all the data used in program review; reference it above

Relevancy of a program

- Program viability process: There have been several large viability studies conducted within the past two years. In 2013, The Learning Skills department underwent viability to streamline the department and offer clearer pathways to integration into Math and English, resulting in an entire rearrangement and revitalization of the department’s curriculum. In 2014-15, the campus studied whether or not intercollegiate athletics were viable on campus, and the committee found that the program is viable, and so once the budget is balanced, the process will begin to restore some limited athletic programs. In 2014-15, Media Arts and Art were condensed into a single department to better share resources, and in 2012, Economics moved from Social Sciences to Business Administration to better mirror the CalState and UC systems.
  - below which ones were archived—Mubarakshin/Dan Walden)

Results of program review used in planning
Improvements resulting from program review

- EPPIC Program Review Summary 2014-15 and 2015-16 (link to both)
- Unit planning objectives (link to online system)
- Improvements resulting from PSLO assessment (link to actual docs, spreadsheet of all)

Faculty engagement in program and course improvements

- All faculty are required to participate in the learning outcomes assessment cycle (AFT Contract, Appendix Q, p. 294, List A, #7)
- Faculty are evaluated on whether they participate in the learning outcomes assessment cycle (AFT Contract, Basic and Comprehensive Evaluation Summary Form for All Faculty, p. 193, #9)
- Faculty are evaluated on whether their course content meets the standards set by the discipline (AFT Contract, Appendix C-Section II, p.195, #9, #10, #11)

DE

Analysis and Evaluation:

Course content and methods of instruction are defined in the official course outline of record, and are articulated in the ‘Course Content and Objectives’ section and learning outcomes statements (Section II, #1) (link to blank Course Outline of Record). Course outlines of record are developed collaboratively within the department, approved locally by the Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate and at the District level by the Board of Trustees (link to sample Curriculum and BoT minutes).

A majority of faculty, staff, and administration (2014: 84%, 2015: 88%) agree that the faculty has a central role in assuring the quality of instruction at LACC (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015) and an overwhelming majority of students (87%) feel that they receive excellent instruction in most of their courses (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #32f). Faculty members are required to engage in program review and learning outcomes assessments (AFT Contract, Appendix Q, p. 294, List A, #7). The ongoing program review cycle is a systematic evaluation of courses and programs. Every course is on a systematic cycle of assessment, which is defined through a 5-Year Assessment Plan (link). Faculty collaborate to assess programs through the comprehensive and annual program review process. The names of all participants are recorded in the online program review update. Student success is demonstrated by the percentage of students who meet the learning outcomes. Success is also determined through additional success rates such as course completions, progression, and retention, which are assessed through program review, and through student and employee surveys.

All courses must be updated every five years, and a review of learning outcomes takes place as part of these course updates (get Title 5 citation from Thelma or April). Course updates include a review of requisites and advisories, course content and objectives, textbooks (to ensure
relevancy), assignments, methods of instruction, relationship to College programs, and articulation information, among other areas. Vocational programs review courses with their advisory boards on a regular basis ([find the Rad Tech minutes from their May 2014 mtg, which reviewed courses for professional standards/expectations; find the notes from the Faculty Learning Award (Jen Vaughn) presentation, which included how courses were updated to meet prof standard]).

Outcomes assessment

**Distance education.** The curriculum for classes taught through DE and outreach is identical to those taught locally, and as such have identified learning outcomes and lead to degrees or certificates. Courses taught via DE have identified online delivery requirements and methods of instruction that define regular and effective contact with the instructor ([link to blank DE Addendum; DE Guidelines Section 55204]). The DE Addendum is attached to the online course outline of record. The College does not offer correspondence education courses. All faculty teaching DE are certified in the approved CMS platform and are trained in online pedagogy. DE courses are assessed in the same way as traditional courses using eLumen. As part of program review, units assess the effectiveness of DE courses and the programs to which those courses align, and compare success rates in DE and traditional courses. The College has identified minimum qualifications for instructors to teach online, and the DE Committee certifies faculty in the use of the CMS platform.

**Standard II.A.3.**
The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution’s officially approved course outline.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Defined and assessed course SLOs

- 100% of courses, both credit and non-credit, have one SLO and X% of courses have two or more SLOs approved by the Curriculum Committee ([CSLO List by Department])
- The College has a procedure for identifying and assessing CSLOs ([Course Assessment Handbook])
- Departments collect assessment data for approximately 25% of their offered courses each semester ([Academic Senate Resolution 02-S14 Student Learning Outcomes and Service Outcomes Assessment Policy, SLO Performance Report for CSLOs by department by year])
- Each department has a plan to assess each CSLO at least every two years ([Assessment Plans])
- Over 90% (Tinberg to update number) of courses have been assessed at least once (evidence)
X% of courses have been assessed twice (evidence)

In 2013-14 and 2014-15 the number of SLO assessments increased (*link to 2013-14 ACCJC Annual Report; 2014-15 ACCJC Annual Report*)

Assessment results are posted on SharePoint (reports)

Action plans are posted on SharePoint (reports)
  * Improvements have occurred (Action plan report with just the question about improvement, Part 4 docs-English 28, Art 305)

Defined and assessed program, certificate and degree SLOs

See Standard I.B.2., p. X

How assessment results are used in course and program review

*Diagram of Relation of Outcomes Assessment to Fulfilling LACC’s Mission*
*CSLO Assessment Handbook (pp.4-5)*
*See Standard XXX for full discussion of program review.*

Role of faculty in decisions

*The SLO & Assessment Committee is comprised primarily of faculty (*link to SLO&A operating agreement*)
*Each academic department has at least one faculty member to shepherd its assessment process, the SLO Department Coordinator, and each course has a Course Coordinator. ([List of faculty serving as SLO Department Coordinators](#))
*Faculty define SLOs for courses and programs in current course outlines of record ([Course Outlines of Record at ecd.laccd.edu](#))
*Course outlines of record are approved by the Curriculum Committee, an Academic Senate subcommittee comprised of faculty (Curriculum Committee operating agreement)
*Faculty are required to provide students a syllabus that includes approved course student learning outcomes (Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article VII, 6705.20)
*Faculty are evaluated on whether they provide a syllabus to all students (AFT Contract, p.193, #12)
*Writing and assessing CSLOs and PSLOs is a faculty obligation ([AFT Contract, Appendix Q, p. 294, List A, #7; AFT Contract Interpretation Clarification of the Meaning of “Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Cycle” on the Faculty Evaluation AllForm](#))

Analysis and Evaluation:
The assessment process for courses, programs, certificates and degrees is developed, evaluated, and revised by the Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee, a twelve-member committee, of which seven members must be faculty (operating agreement). The Committee writes resolutions and assessment handbooks which must be approved by the Academic Senate (Resolutions, CSLO Assessment Handbook, PSLO Assessment Handbook, Senate’s May minutes). Write annual report (make a statement about this)
Identifying and assessing learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees is the responsibility of the faculty. Faculty define the CSLOs which must be reviewed and approved by the Campus SLO Coordinator and Curriculum Committee through the standard course approval process (CSLO Assessment Handbook, p.6). All courses, both credit and non-credit, have at least two approved CSLOs which appear on officially approved and current course outlines (Course Outlines of Record at ecd.laccd.edu). Writing and assessing CSLOs and PSLOs is a faculty obligation (AFT Contract, Appendix Q, p. 294, List A, #7; AFT Contract Interpretation Clarification of the Meaning of “Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Cycle” on the Faculty Evaluation Form).

Faculty are responsible for communicating the CSLOs to their students. During the first week of classes, faculty must provide “students and the Department Chairperson (in hard copy or electronically) a syllabus that describes work product,” “grading criteria for the class,” and the “approved course student learning outcomes” (Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article VII, 6705.20). The Vice President of Academic Affairs sends faculty a newsletter at the start of each semester reminding them of the Board rule (link). Syllabi for DE courses also adhere to this rule (Distance Education Handbook, p.13). Faculty are evaluated on whether they provide a syllabus to all students (AFT Contract, p.193, #12). Over 90% of students agree that course syllabi are followed, 78% are aware of learning outcomes for their program, and 88% are aware of the learning outcomes for their courses (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #23f, 32c, 32d).

Each department’s assessment activities is shepherded by at least one faculty member, the SLO Department Coordinator (Department Coordinators-List of Faculty, Department Coordinator Role and Responsibilities). Larger departments, such as Math and English, or those with multiple disciplines, have two or more Department Coordinators. Course assessment activities are led by Course Coordinators (Course Coordinator Roles and Responsibilities). Coordinators utilize their department’s 5-year Course and Program Assessment Plan, which identifies the semester (for CSLOs) and year (for PSLOs) that each SLO begins a new assessment cycle (Assessment Plans). A cycle includes initial assessment, writing and implementing action plans, reassessing the SLO, and reporting on the effectiveness of the action plan. Departments are tasked with having approximately 25% of their offered courses start the assessment cycle each semester (Senate Resolution #02-S14). Coordinators also make use of the college-wide assessment timeline to guide their department and course assessment work (Assessment Timeline). Coordinators receive regular training and support from the Campus SLO Coordinator. (SLO Check-Ups). All faculty have access to online resources on how to write SLOs, design authentic assessment tasks, and create assessment rubrics (Academic Affairs Resources).

Course assessment processes emphasize collaboration. Faculty work together to write SLOs, decide on the assessment tasks, and create rubrics (handbook, p.X, meeting notes). Also, between 2007-2014, all SLOs were scored by more than one faculty member, what we call the “group scoring method”. This entails at least two or three faculty members independently scoring each student’s work. Faculty then discuss their scores with each other and decide on the assignment’s final score. Many disciplines found great benefit from the dialog that came out of the experience (ESL, yoga, music). But, “group scoring” significantly slowed assessment for
many because of the high workload it demanded and because it often took months for faculty to find a time to meet to discuss their scores. So, the SLO Committee revised the assessment process and made “group scoring” optional, though still considered a “best practice” because of its potential to give the greatest insights into student learning (CSLO Assessment Handbook, p. 9). There are still departments that continue to use group scoring. ESL faculty embraced this method and have 2-3 faculty members meet, read and score the essays, discuss their scores and any differences in how they scored, then agree on a final score. For instance, ESL faculty sit in a room together to read and score essays, discuss, then agree on a final score (links to emails, dialogue forms). Communication Studies faculty watch live or taped hear students delivering speeches (evidence). One more… It is in the more objective type of assessments, such as math problem solving, that group scoring is less prevalent.

Since the College began outcomes assessment in 2007, we have assessed our CSLOs with analytic rubrics. These give a more thorough look at students’ learning needs than holistic rubrics and leads to better action planning. From 2007 to 2014, all rubrics were required to have at least three criterion and to use a three level scoring system of unacceptable, acceptable, and exemplary. Last year, our assessment software, eLumen, released a new version enabling us to also use a two, four, or five level rubrics (Heisser history rubric, another one?). Faculty must submit their rubrics to the Campus SLO Coordinator for approval (CSLO Assessment Handbook, p. 4). Once approved, the SLO Office inputs the rubric into eLumen.

The 5-year Course and Program Assessment Plan identifies in which semester the action plan is to be input into eLumen, implemented, and reassessed. For some courses, the plan is entered the same semester, for others it is entered the following semester. This is dependent on how many sections of a course were assessed and when faculty can get together to discuss the scores and create a mutually acceptable plan. For example, English 101 and 102 were assessed in June 2015. Faculty met in XXX, after returning from summer break, to discuss and create action plans (evidence, English 101 – Miklos, English 102 –mueller, Soteriu, copy of action plans). The assessment handbook guides instructors on writing action plans (CSLO Assessment Handbook p. 11-12). From 2007-XXXX, instructors completed a document called Part 3: Analysis and Action Plan for each CSLO that was assessed (links to these on SP).

Faculty then uses assessment results to improve courses. From 2007 to XXXX, faculty documented this by completing a document called Part 4 Implementation of Action Plan (link to Part 4 –Implementation of Action Plans) – CT to include % completed. Faculty wrote comments on their perception of whether or not student success on the CSLO was improved due to the action plan. Starting in 2012 faculty were required to reassess outcomes and review student success based on comparative SLO numerical data (link: CT to run reports comparing SLO results between years). Add examples.

Since a program is only as good as its courses, assessment results from courses are the basis for assessing a program’s student learning outcomes. These course SLO results are stated in the PSLO assessment report, which is a component of annual program review. Also, course action plans should be used to develop program action plans. Programs use these program action plans to create unit planning objectives in program review (PSLO Assessment Handbook, p.X,
Diagram). For example, (example from the most recent annual program review of a unit planning objective derived from SLO assessment). Units that do not complete learning outcomes assessments are not eligible to submit resource requests and are penalized in the hiring prioritization process (link to program review template; Senate resolution?). For a full discussion of program review, see Standard X.XX.

To ensure that assessment insights gained at the course level are shared with the entire department, SLO dialog is a standing agenda item at all department meetings, with the dialog documented (Resolution #2-Fa15; Dialog Form). Faculty are using this time to …..gets some examples (link to dialog completed forms).

For a thorough analysis and evaluation of our program, certificate and degree assessment procedures, see Standard I.B.2., on page X.

Employees agree that their unit has an effective faculty-driven process for assessing SLOs (2014: 68%; 2015: 76%), has sufficient research and data to assess progress toward achieving stated SLOs (2014: 56%; 2015: 66%), has used the results of SLO assessment to improve quality in instruction and/or support services (2014: 57%; 2015: 65%), engages in ongoing and robust dialogue about improving student learning (2014: 60%; 2015: 68%), and that their students are aware of the goals and purposes of the courses and programs in which they are enrolled (2014: 70%; 2015: 80%). (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

**Action item.** Add questions to the LACCD student survey asking students about their familiarity with SLOs and the outcomes of assessments.

**Standard II.A.4.**

*If the institution offers pre-collegiate level curriculum, it distinguishes that curriculum from college level curriculum and directly supports students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

The College offers the following pre-collegiate curriculum: Learning Skills, English and ESL, Community Services, Intensive English Program, English 28 and 67, English Literacy Program and Citizenship Center, Non-credit, Math, Contract Education, Gateway to College, Project Degree, Job Readiness

- The College has separate sections in the catalog for courses that are below the level of curriculum that satisfies requirements for either degrees or transfer (Thelma Day to provide link to correct pages in Catalog)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College offers a number of courses, both credit and noncredit, that are below the level of curriculum that satisfies requirements for either degrees or transfer. These include _____. Pre-collegiate courses are coded as such. **April Pavlik/Thelma Day to ask the District to run a**
A report that lists all these courses (search on CIV, state curriculum site, under CB-21 coding). The counseling office provides separate information on how pre-collegiate courses lead to collegiate courses. Students develop an Educational Plan based on assessment scores in Math and English. As part of orientation and Educational Plan development, students are given information about pathways from pre-collegiate courses to collegiate courses (evidence?).

Learning Skills. Describe. Criteria/processes for offering: What assessments have been done on % of incoming students who need learning skills? Maryanne DesVignes

In fall 2014 the College completed a viability study on the Learning Skills program (Preliminary Report on Learning Skills, December 2014). The committee recommended that Learning Skills revise its mission to focus primarily on basic skills English language and Mathematics remediation, and that the College create clear and straightforward prerequisite pathways from basic skills to college level English/ESL and Mathematics with the goal of improving the output of degrees, certificates and transfers. The Learning Skills Department subsequently revised its mission to align with the college mission. The new mission of the department is to provide “instructional assistance in individual and group settings in reading, English fundamentals, vocabulary, writing, study skills, basic mathematics, and elementary algebra by supporting direct pathways into the English and Math Department’s sequences of courses.” The department revised its course outlines and redesigned its course pathways into English and Mathematics. The revision included eliminating duplicate sections, archiving courses that do not support the pathways, adding sections to simplify transitions within the sequence, and adjusting English/Reading TABE placement scores. Moving forward the department will review data including pre- and post-tests of Learning Skills students, and results of assessment/entry exams into the English and Mathematics pathways, with the goal of improving the courses and pathways. (Learning Skills Pathways to Success Update, July 2015).

English and ESL. Consistent with a high concentration of immigrant and non-native English-speaking population in its immediate service area, the College offers credit-level education in the English as a Second Language discipline. The credit ESL program provides a direct pathway for these students to attain college education. Learning outcomes are defined and assessed using the group scoring method (link to score reports, rubrics—Tinberg?). The number of credit ESL course sections offered each semester relates to student demand. Both developmental English and credit ESL courses offer multi-level curriculum tracks, culminating in the transfer-level English course, English 101. The ESL program curriculum exit skills are directly tied to the entry skills in both English 101, and the English writing course one level below. The department supports first-day diagnostic tests in individual courses to best determine student placement. After placement, the department offers clear processes for students to challenge their initial placement and to transfer, when eligible, within or between tracks. The majority of incoming students assess into English 28 (with co-requisite tutorial English 67), which is one course level below freshman composition.

English Literacy Program and Citizenship Center. Write about this. Who oversees this?

Contract education. The College offers courses as part of the Child Development Korean American Children and Parent Services Organization and Child Development LA Universal Pre-
School Partnership. *Success rates for these cohorts are on SharePoint—Alex Davis is going to upload files to this link.* All courses are approved through the College’s curriculum process. Alignment with college-level curriculum to ensure pathways for students?

**Non Credit.** The non-credit programs offers open entry pre-collegiate courses. All courses are approved through the College’s curriculum process. Learning outcomes are defined and assessed using the group scoring method (*link to score reports, rubrics*—Tinberg?). Email left with Alex Davis. *Do we track how many of these students ultimately enroll in credit courses?* Processes to align pre-collegiate curriculum with college-level curriculum to ensure pathways for students?

**Gateway to College.** This developmental, pre-collegiate program is part of a contract between the College and several high schools, part of the Gateway to College National Network collaborative partnership. Learning outcomes are defined and assessed using the group scoring method (*link to score reports, rubrics*—Tinberg?).—email left with Alex Davis. All courses are approved through the College’s curriculum process and a portion of courses are offered as dual enrollment. Students matriculate same as traditional students (Ed Plan, etc.). Resource specialists and counselors are available for mentoring, tutoring, career pathways, and to help students transition to the College once they complete their high school degree (*Alex Davis to give us the #s*).

**Project Degree.** Developmental education (*Email sent to Fabiola Mora*)

**Job Readiness.** Short-term training)—email left with Angelica Ramirez

**Math 105.** email left with Kian Kaviani

**Community Services.** The College offers community service classes based on demand in the service area (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter XII). All courses and programs have identified learning outcomes that ensure that they serve a specific need and support a defined curriculum. Community Services uses classrooms both on and off-site to ensure access for the community, and most courses are offered in the evening to appeal to the target population of older, employed members of the community. A Community Services program learning outcome is to deliver auxiliary support offerings for credit and non-credit programs and for student support services. The program uses a student feedback survey to gauge student interest in credit courses; the majority of students (53%) who take community services classes state they are likely to enroll in credit courses (*evidence? Ask Drew*).

**Intensive English Program.** This one-year non-credit program include four levels of ESL and is part of community services. 80% who complete the program transfer into our credit programs (*evidence*?). Students who complete the program have the ability to enter into the College credit program without the required TOEFL. [Randy—what else can you say about this?]

**Distance education.** The College does not offer developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, short-term training, international student, or contract education programs in DE mode.
Quality Focus Essay Plan. Measure: Decrease in average time students need to complete the basic skills pathway; Pre-collegiate level curriculum.
2.3.1 Curriculum development to accelerate student completion of remedial education courses; Pre-collegiate level curriculum.

Wanner to write this]

Standard II.A.5.
The institution’s degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The institution ensures that minimum degree requirements are 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate level, and 120 credits or equivalent at the baccalaureate level.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- All degrees and certificates have an identified course sequence (Catalog, pp. 41-93)
- The College requires that programs have an appropriate length, breadth, course sequencing, and time to completion (EPPIC New Program Request)
- All degrees and certificates of achievement are approved by the State Chancellor’s Office (ask Mardeza Salinas to run a report from the Chancellor’s website)
- All our AA-Ts articulate with CSU institutions (ask Mardeza Salinas to run a report from the Chancellor’s website or another site that lists these)
- All degrees and certificates have PSLOs that require a synthesis of learning (PSLOs for Instructional Programs)
- All AA degrees are 60 units or over. The College does not offer baccalaureate degrees. (link to Catalog)

Analysis and Evaluation:

EPPIC and the Curriculum Committee must approve all new programs using a District Proposed New Program Request (PNPR), which corresponds to the State Chancellor’s Office form CCC-501: Application for New Credit Program.” Programs must be consistent with the college mission; have a defined background and rationale; enrollment and completer projections; and quality as determined by the sequence of courses fits together, synthesis of learning, and time to completion. Non-state approved skills certificates are approved through EPPIC and the Curriculum Committee. All AA-T degrees are articulated with CSUs. All AA, AA-T, and certificates of achievement have been approved by the State Chancellor’s Office. The ACCJC is notified through a substantive change report of any changes or additions (Substantive Change Report New Degrees). Formulas built into the District Accounting Attendance Office’s Protocol, DEC, and ECD platforms ensure that the College is compliant with all requirements concerning assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths.

Degrees and certificates have an identified course sequence, including total units required, and all Associate degrees require 60 units or more in a selected curriculum. (Catalog, pp. 41-93.
LACCD Board Rule, Chapter VI, Article II, 6201.10; California Code of Regulations Title 5, Division 6, Chapter 6, Subchapter 1, Article 6, Section 55063 The synthesis of learning required for each program is stated in the PSLOs (PSLOs for Instructional Programs).

Standard II.A.6.
The institution schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in higher education.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Achievement and evaluation
- PSLOs are assessed for each level of stackable skill certificates culminating in certificates of achievement, including those in Music (instrumental performer, vocal performer, music technology, orchestrator/arranger), Theater (costume design I and II, technical theater I and II), Cinema/TV(?), Spanish I and II, Korean I and II (C Tinberg to provide a link on SharePoint—program outcomes assessment report; 5-year plans)
- The College assesses student learning outcomes for every course, including those that are part of a sequence of courses. These include ESL 1-8, ESL Civics 1-6, English Literacy and Civics 1-3, Non-credit ESL (?), others?? (C Tinberg to provide a link on SharePoint—assessment activity report)

Scheduling of classes
- The College expects that degree and certificates can be completed within two years (LACC Enrollment Management Plan, p.5)
- The College has examined the length of time it takes students to complete degrees (Time to Degree Completion Report 2014)
- The College has examined the unit load to earn each certificate of achievement (2014-15 Certificate Analysis)

Analysis and Evaluation

The College’s planning assumption is that “students should be provided the opportunity to complete a degree or program within two years” (LACC Enrollment Management Plan, p.5). The California Community College’s Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) defines their completion rate as six years for certificates and degrees, though this is for scorecard purposes and is not a definition of established expectations (Scorecard Completion Definition).

A majority of students (60%) agree that they are able to follow the recommended list of courses in their educational plan (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #20). This relatively low number, however, suggests that College can take additional steps to inform students about program pathways.

Action Item (Emil)
- study to ensure that all programs can be completed within a reasonable amount of time
The study will be continued to assess the actual certificates awarded and compare it actual course offerings.

The College will be expanding the study to include review of degree programs’ requirements and actual degree awards along with course offerings. EMIL - find out where we stand on expanding this study (I)

Did we ever complete a report that lists every course tied to every degree/cert and when the course was offered, to see if a student can actually complete the program in two years? Ed Pai mentioned as much at a few meetings…

Quality Focus Essay Plan. Align with Objective 2.4: Create Second Year Experience; Measure: increase in students completing educational goal within six years…”established expectations.”

Measure: Increase in students completing educational goal within six years; “established expectations”

[Wanter to write this]

Standard II.A.7.
The institution effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies, and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students, in support of equity in success for all students.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

How the College understands and is meeting the needs and learning styles of its students

- Work on this…

Multiple ways of assessing learning

- Rubrics and authentic assessments (link to rubrics, spreadsheet of authentic assessments, cslo handbook, p.X-X)

Analysis and Evaluation:

CSLOs are assessed with faculty created rubrics that consist ideally of at least three criterion and either 2, 3, 4 or 5 levels. Faculty submit the rubrics to the Campus SLO Coordinator for review and approval (handbook pages). The Coordinator ensures that the assessment task aligns with the CSLO and that the assessment type is authentic. We do not allow multiple choice or true-false type assessments. So, CSLOs are assessed in a variety of ways, such as through lab reports, math problems, musical performance, oral presentation, essays, research papers, artistic creations, etc…(spreadsheet of assessments) All of our historical rubrics are loaded onto
SharePoint which describe the assessment. We do not have printouts of newer rubrics because they are input directly into eLumen and eLumen does not have the ability to print these rubrics.

**Distance Education**
- DE Handbook (*link to page*)
- # of approved faculty (*Pam Atkinson*)
- Change to a single CMS so students do not have to learn multiple systems
- Writing of a DE Plan with measurable objectives
- Significant increase in percentage of DE sections offered
- Faculty are required to do CMS and online pedagogy training

**Professional Development Activities.** For a complete list of professional development activities, evaluation, and outcomes, including those in support of equity in success for all students, see Standard III.A.14.

**Teaching Methodologies**
The course outline of record has the following requirements (*Course Outline of Record, Section 2*):
- Methods of evaluation must require grades to be “based on demonstrated proficiency in subject matter and the ability to demonstrate that proficiency, at least in part, by means of essays, or, in courses where the curriculum committee deems them to be appropriate, by problem solving exercises or skills demonstrations by students” (*Title 5, section 55002*)
- Must define methods of instruction as discussion, activity, field experience, independent study, purposeful collaboration, or other
- Must explain how diversity is infused into the course
- Vocational courses must identify SCANS (Secretary’s Commission on Necessary Skills), which are skills the Department of Labor identified, in consultation with business and industry leaders, that reflect the skills necessary for success in the workplace
- Building renovations have included smart-classrooms that allowed for more technology enhanced lectures

**Learning Support Services**
The campus provides many services to assist students with different learning styles or needs, based on an assessment of pedagogy and effectiveness of current teaching and student support methods. The College identifies “underprepared students” (two levels below Math transfer; one level below English transfer) through……. Through the District-wide Persistence Inquiry Project (PIP), the College has been able to better understand student need (*Outcomes: Wait for info from Daryl Kinney*). Through its work in Achieving the Dream, SSSP, and the Equity Plan, the
College has been able to identify types of students that need specialized support, and provide those support services through a variety of programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students supported</th>
<th>Delivery modes, Methodologies, Support services</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-time, academically underprepared students</td>
<td>Basic Skill courses that focus entirely on remediation.</td>
<td>Achieving the Dream initiatives: First-year experience, SSSP, College Bridge, expanded K-12 Partners, FTLA-Math/FTLACC, Book Program, College Governance, Learning Skills Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with young children</td>
<td>Learning environment for the children of LACC students</td>
<td>Child Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, white, male, foster youth, veteran, African American, Hispanic, DSPS, economically disadvantaged, etc. (et the page numbers from the Student Equity Plan)</td>
<td>Guardian Scholars, TRIO, Veteran’s Affairs</td>
<td>Student Equity Plan activities: first year program, second year program, professional development training, Veteran’s Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time students</td>
<td>Assessment, orientation, Ed Plan (counseling)</td>
<td>SSSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged (?)</td>
<td>Financial Aid, EOP&amp;S,</td>
<td>Financial Aid (% of students?), PELL Grants (% of students?), book vouchers (% of students?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional students</td>
<td>24-hour online librarian support service Online Advising Online Tutoring (pilot)</td>
<td>Library Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently employed, with children (#15, #16, #9 in the Student Survey); Non-traditional students</td>
<td>24-hour online librarian support service Online Advising Online Tutoring (pilot) child development daycare center Vouchers/Referrals (Child Dev) for daycare for night classes.</td>
<td>Distance Ed courses, Child Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disabilities (question #10 from the student survey)</td>
<td>Academic Adjustments, Academic Counseling, Assistive Technology, Assistive/Adaptive Technology Training, Alternate-Text Production,</td>
<td>OSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Services and Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille Transcription, Large-Print Magnification, Learning Disabilities Assessment, On-campus Mobility Orientation, Priority Registration, Referrals (on/off campus support), Sign Language Interpreting, Specialized Instruction, Specialized Tutoring, Student Educational Plans/Student Educational Contracts, Testing and Exam Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills Math and English</td>
<td>One-on-one instruction, tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Skills English Writing Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Pi Shoppe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students</td>
<td>English training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive English Program (international student center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology: Computer labs</td>
<td>Buildings: Jefferson, Franklin, Cesar Chavez, Student Union, Chemistry, Library, Clausen, Bungalows, Da Vinci, Cinema-TV, CAF (?), Theatre,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to Emma Tiscareno</td>
<td>Career Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student with disabilities</td>
<td>Computer technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS (High Tech Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with communication disorders</td>
<td>Talk to Helen Bunn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills Math and English</td>
<td>Supplemental instruction One-on-One Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year experience (Supplemental Instruction program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/ESL Writing Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO Ralph Bunche Transfer Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer bound first-time students, first generation, low income, disabilities</td>
<td>Dedicated computer lab, workshops, field trips, counseling, tutoring, symposiums, personal statement workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income, parent of a child under 18, students pursuing CTE or AA degrees.</td>
<td>Counseling, workshops, workforce training, child care services, work-study programs, math tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First-time students, first generation, low income, disabilities | Workshops, orientation, counseling, book vouchers, tutoring | EOP&S/CARE
---|---|---
Veterans | Workshops, Counseling, Tutoring, advocacy | Veteran’s Program
Students with leadership aptitude | Trainings, workshops, co-curricular programing, access to resources. | Student Life
Transfer bound honor’s students | Workshops, seminars, and enrichment activities, symposiums, additional curriculum, work-study opportunities. | Honor’s Program
Transfer bound students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math | Workshops, seminars, internships, tutoring, academic counseling, | STEM Program
Career and Technical education oriented students. | Internships, co-curricular programming, job/internship placement. | Cooperative Education
Foster youth | Workshops, Counseling, Priority registration, book loans, social and cultural events, housing and job referrals. | Guardian Scholars
Underserved, low income, first generation, potential college graduates attending impacted LAUSD High schools. | Tutoring at high school site, career and college advisement, monthly visits to local colleges, 6 week summer intensive program. | Upward Bound
Low income, college-prepared, 7th grade to Freshmen college year cohort students. | Tutoring, Campus tours, dual-enrollment, CTE boot camps. | Gear Up
Students needing psychological support | Mental health services, crisis intervention, in-service training | Life Skills Center Health and Wellness Center

*Source: 2013 College Profile*

The College provides tutoring services to support students in a variety of subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Skills</td>
<td>Various subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Earth Sciences</td>
<td>Introductory and General Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Readiness Academy</td>
<td>Math and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A majority of students (90%) agree that instructors inform them about the types of skills or learning outcomes that they are expected to master through their classroom activities and assignments (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #23h). An overwhelming amount of faculty, staff, and administration members agree that the College is familiar with a variety of pedagogical approaches to meet the diverse needs and learning styles of their students (2014: 77%; 2015: 84%), and an even higher amount agree that the College uses teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs of their students (2014, 2015 LACC Campus Climate Survey).

The campus provides a wide variety of services to our diverse student population that demonstrates an understanding of the needs and learning styles of our population. Through Program Review and Enrollment Management, the campus determines the ratio of traditional courses to Distance Education courses, and the mode of delivery for DE courses is monitored and assessed by the Distance Education Committee.

Through the faculty evaluation process, each instructor’s methodologies are evaluated by their peers to ensure the appropriateness and effectiveness of each instructor’s pedagogy. The FTLA academy covers a wide range of successful methodologies as does the New Faculty Academy. During the annual Faculty Symposium, breakout sessions are included that cover different methodologies in the classroom (link to David Seghi’s stuff).

The campus investigates the success measures of DE students to traditional students (link), and further refinement of DE practices aim to better align these success rates. The DE committee, Curriculum Committee, and EPPIC are responsible for ensuring that delivery modes and instructional methodologies are effective in practice.

**Distance Education.**

The DE Committee has an online tutorial for students to assist them in identifying their distinct learning styles and if that correlates well to the DE mode (link to this). All DE instructors are required to take a recognized DE pedagogy class to better serve various learning styles. The DE committee offers comments and suggestions to new DE instructors and courses to align to the DE and Curriculum Rubric as well as ensure that the mode of delivery addresses multiple learning styles.
The DE Committee is responsible for sharing up-to-date pedagogical approaches to the campus through the governance structure. The campus demonstrates the success of DE courses through the standard success measure as identified by the state (link to these).

DE courses are assessed in the same manner as traditional courses; however, the DE committee ensures that DE courses include multiple types of assessments for students. In the DE addendum form that all DE courses must have in ECD (link to blank form), each department must demonstrate how the course content will be adapted to the DE mode. During the curricular process, faculty must present their rationale to the Curriculum committee at large as well as through the DE committee for technical review.

**Standard II.A.8.**

*The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Department-wide course exams

- The Math Department utilizes a standard department wide final exam for Math 125
- We do not have any other department-wide course or program exams

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The Math 125 exam is unbiased and a valid measure of student learning

- Exam is written by a committee
- Date and time of common final exam is included on the syllabus
- Committee comprised of full time Math faculty specializing in the topic
- Committee members do not teach Math 125 in that specific semester
- Questions selected from a bank of questions provided by all full time and adjunct faculty
- Exam is sealed until 15 minutes before starting time
- Only two members of the committee have access to the exam and make copies
- All OSS students are provided accommodations as required
- Student are given access to exams from previous years
- Full time and adjunct faculty grade exams in a common location immediately following the exam
- The exam and answer sheet are proctored by a faculty member
- Common final exam constitutes approximately 30% of the grade
- Graded exams are given to instructors of each section for record-keeping and review
- No student should get two grade-levels higher than the grade on the common final exam
- Students are placed in a random fashion in each classroom
• No instructor proctors his/her own class
• Before the exam starts a picture student ID of each student is checked by the proctor
• The average score of each section is compared to the global average of all sections to compare performance of each instructor
• The retention (defined as number of students who take the final exam) of each faculty as well as the average retention for all sections for Math 125 are calculated and put on a control chart. Data is monitored for irregularities. Define irregularities as the averages vary more than two standard deviations from the average (mean) of these measures.
• Instructors with low performance are reassigned to teach courses that do not contain a common final.
• In-house software analyzes each problem (a total of 20 problems given in each test), reporting irregularities compared to previous tests. Software identifies the topics that students find more difficult, allowing faculty to focus on those topics in the future.
• Common final exam has resulted in a more uniform delivery of the course material and a more uniform learning environment for all students.

Outcomes include:
  o Creating an alternate version of Intermediate Algebra (Math 125) as Math 124A and Math 124B without a common final exam, allowing students more time to process information
  o Increased ability to recognize faculty strengths. Faculty who routinely have much higher than the average score in their sections share their insights on their methodologies and approaches at department meetings.
  o Increased ability to recognize topics needing additional emphasis.

Standard II.A.9.
The institution awards course credit, degrees, and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

CSLOs are the basis for awarding credit
• CSLOs are statements describing the knowledges, skills, abilities and/or attitudes that students should attain by the end of any set of college experiences (SLO Statements - Checklist to evaluate them)
• All courses have CSLOs (CSLO List by Department)
• CSLOs are assessed with authentic, embedded tasks (CSLO Assessment Handbook, p. X, Authentic Assessments, rubrics)

Credits awarded are consistent with accepted norms
• Units of credit are identified in the course outline of record and follow the Carnegie Rule, Title 5 regulations, California Intersegmental Articulation Council policies, C-ID, and/or CSU/UC norms (BIO 25 Course Outline of Record, Engineering 131 Course Outline of Record)
• The College does not offer courses based on clock hours.

Achievement of PSLOs are the basis for awarding degrees and certificates
• PSLOs are statements that describe what graduates are able to do with what they have learned (PSLO Assessment Handbook, pp. 6-7)
• All programs have identified PSLOs (PSLOs for Instructional Programs)
• PSLOs are assessed using data from CSLOs mapped to PSLOs (PSLO Assessment Handbook, pp. 8-10, two examples, Program Assessment Report by department, by year)
• LACCD Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article II, 6202

Analysis and Evaluation:

All courses have CSLOs that are overarching statements describing course content that is critical and central to success in the course (Course Assessment Handbook, pX, CSLO List for all classes). CSLOs are assessed using authentic, embedded assessments (Catalog, p x). Therefore, the assessments are also graded, so a student’s performance on the course outcome factors in the final course grade and the awarding of course credit. In this way, course credit is awarded based on a student’s attainment of the CSLOs.

Formulas built into the District Accounting Attendance Office’s Protocol, DEC, and ECD platforms ensure that the College is compliant with all requirements concerning assignment of credit hours. One credit hour of community college work is approximately three hours of recitation, study, or laboratory work per week throughout a term of 16 weeks (Catalog, p. x). The course outline of record identifies unit credit awarded (lecture/lab) based on Carnegie Rule and Title 5 regulations (1 unit=18 hours of lecture or 36 hours of lab with homework or 54 hours of lab without homework). When adding a course into ESC, the system automatically calculates the correct number of course hours, including holidays.

The College currently has 14 state approved Associate of Arts degrees for Transfer (catalog, p. X). In order for those degrees to be approved by the state, the requisite courses had to follow the approved course descriptors and units to achieve C-ID alignment. For transferrable courses that do not have a final descriptor in C-ID, the College awards units of credit based on norms accepted in the state and articulation agreements with public and private four-year institutions. The College’s articulation officer reviews comparable courses at UC, CSU, and private schools and uses the CIAC (California Intersegmental Articulation Council) Handbook as a reference for policies on transferrable courses. The articulation officer reviews these areas in the course outline of record before the course is considered for approval by the Curriculum Committee.

All degree and certificate programs have PSLOs that are statements of what graduates are able to do at the completion of an entire course of study (PSLO Assessment Handbook, pp. 6-7, PSLOs)
for Instructional Programs). They are assessed by examining the results from the specific CSLOs that students must achieve in order to demonstrate mastery of the PSLOs (PSLO Assessment Handbook, pp. 8-10). Since the students’ work is graded and thus, influences the awarding of courses credit, if students do not achieve success with the CSLOs or the unique assessment task, they will not earn the degree or certificate. In this manner, the achievement of the PSLOs are the basis for awarding degrees and certificates.

Several programs learned while completing their 2014-15 PSLO assessments that some of their CSLOs statements did not align well with their PSLOs. This is because when the College began the SLO process, faculty were directed to first create the CSLOs. Then, years later, they were directed to write the PSLOs. Since these directions came years apart and no instruction occurred on the relation between PSLOs and CSLOs, faculty did not know how PSLOs and CSLOs needed to interact with each other. Consequently, in some programs, the CSLO results give only a small picture of how students are doing with the PSLO. The College should have created the PSLOs first, then the CSLOs so there would be better alignment. The programs with poor alignment made action plans to revise the CSLOs and/or PSLOs to ensure that PSLOs are appropriately evaluated (examples nursing, photography).

Degrees and certificates are awarded after a review of transcripts to ensure that students have passed all the classes as indicated in the college catalog, during their continuous enrollment (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article II, 6202). Petitions for degrees are reviewed in the Admissions and Records Office by a graduation evaluator, who confirms course completion from the student’s transcript. Petitions for certificates are reviewed by the department chair, who confirms course completion from the student’s transcript. The department chair sends a report to the Office of Admissions and Records, who evaluates the petition against the college catalog.

**Standard II.A.10.**
The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Transfer of credit policies
- The College uses ASSIST as the official repository of articulation information for California’s public colleges and universities. ([assist.org](http://assist.org))
- The College follows the District policies ([Board Rule Chapter VI, Article VI, 6600](http://www.laccd.edu/Policy/6600.pdf))
- The College follows administrative regulations for acceptance of credits:
  - Acceptance of degree-applicable coursework completed at other colleges for the purpose of Associate Degree general education, ([E-93](http://www.laccd.edu/Policy/E93.html))
Acceptance of foreign courses: Credit for Courses Taken at Institutions of Higher Learning Outside the United States, (E-101)
Acceptance of advanced placement exams: Advanced Placement Credit, E-110
Acceptance of military service credit (E-118)
Acceptance of Upper-Division Coursework to Meet Associate Degree Requirements (E-119)
Acceptance of International Baccalaureate Credit (E-122)
Acceptance of CLEP Credit (E-123)

- The College’s transfer-of-credit policies are in the catalog and schedule of classes (link to Catalog, p.X, Fall 2015 Schedule of Classes, p.X)
- College websites have transfer information (Ralph Bunche Scholars, Transfer: General Information, TRIO/SSS, University Transfer Center)

Articulation agreements
- The College follows the policies of the California Articulation Handbook (Articulation Handbook)
- The College’s articulation agreements are found on the website ASSIST (Assist.org for LACC)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Transfer-of-Credit Policies
The College adheres to the District’s transfer policies (Board Rule Chapter VI, Article VI, 6600) and the various Administrative Regulations for acceptance of credits (E-93, E-101, E-110, E-118 E-119, E-122, E-123). Policies are made available to students in the catalog and schedule of classes. The information includes: general information for transfer, transfer of career education classes, course credit value, UC transfer requirements and advanced standing admission, CSU admission requirements and transfer information, IGETC policy, CSU general education certification, and policies for admission to independent colleges (Catalog, pp.X-X, schedule X-X).

Students can access college websites to learn about transfer policies. The University Transfer Center has extensive resources and reference materials on their website, such as links to articulation agreements, admissions guides, and the IGETC requirements to transfer to the CSU/UC systems (University Transfer Center). The Counseling Services website has a list of majors at LACC, GE requirements, and CSU/UC requirements (Counseling Services). When students visit either of these offices in person, they may pick up documents with transfer information. The Ralph Bunche Scholars Program provides information on such programs as the high school fast track and UCLA transfer alliance (Scholars Program).

When students file a Graduation Petition and are requesting credit for courses taken at other colleges and universities they must submit those official transcript to the Admissions Office. (Graduation Petition). An evaluation technician in the Admissions Office reviews the transcripts to see if the course content and objectives from the transferred courses matches those of LACC’s
courses. If the technician is unfamiliar with the course, the department chair is contacted to add expertise.

Articulation Agreements
Coursework completed at LACC may be transferred to a four-year institution through a number of articulation agreements, including general transferability, GE patterns, and individual major prep for all the UCs, CSUs, and various independent colleges in southern California. These articulation agreements are listed at assist.org (Assist.org LACC Courses Applicable for Transfer). Students can follow the IGETC to meet all the lower division general education requirements for UC or CSU schools, or they can follow the CSU general education breadth requirements to ensure that all lower division general education requirements have been met for the CSU system.

LACC has a full time articulation officer who ensures that LACC follows the policies of the California Articulation Handbook (Articulation Handbook). The articulation officer reviews all course outlines of record and advises faculty if there are four-year institution curriculum changes that could impact transferring students. The officer sits by position on the Curriculum Committee.

Distance education. The College does not offer DE programs and therefore does not have articulation agreements for DE programs. The College considers transfer of credit for distance education courses in the same manner that it does for traditional courses.

Standard II.A.11.
The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Criteria the College uses for each program
- The College requires that programs have an appropriate length, breadth, course sequencing, and time to completion (EPPIC New Program Request)
- Faculty have primary responsibility for determining the program-specific learning outcomes (PSLO Assessment Handbook, p.6)

Student achievement of the intended outcomes
- All courses and CSLOs are mapped to program learning outcomes (two examples, Curriculum Maps, by department, by year)
- The College’s has eleven institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs) (link to ISLOs pdf, catalog p.X)
• ISLOs are assessed by aggregating the CSLO scores that map to a particular ISLO (ISLO Rubric Scores 2008-2012, Frequency by Raw Scores, % of Exemplary Scores)
• ISLO Results 2012- spring 2015
• Students agree that upon graduation they attained the 11 ISLOs (ISLO graduate exit surveys 2013, 2014)
• SLO Annual Report 2014-15

Promotion of student understanding and appreciation of diverse perspectives

• Study Abroad Programs (Foreign Language, Anthropology)
• Instructional Program activities (Foreign Language Day)
• Extracurricular programming (Martin Luther King Day event, Student Life)
• College Book Program hosts yearly events that expose students to different perspectives in literature and society through varied public speaking engagements and Book of the Year activities. (ask Alex Maeck about flyers/schedules—write up a brief summary of outcomes: # of participants, # of events, etc.)
• CSLO assessment tasks mapped to ISLO #10: Intercultural knowledge and exploration (get a # link frequency by raw scores chart 2008-2012 (make a new chart with 2012-2015)

Information competencies, how they are taught, and how they are assessed

• The College teaches student to read, gather, evaluate, organize, and synthesize information from a variety of sources and media and use appropriate reasoning, analytic, interpretive, and problem solving strategies to draw logical conclusions or formulate creative solutions (pdf of ISLOs, catalog p.X)
• Each course outline of record requires, if applicable, an explanation of how information competency is included in the course (Course Outline of Record, Section 2, #8)
• The Library offers bibliographical workshops, library orientations for courses, and one-on-one reference desk assistance (including a 24/7 online reference desk). (link to library assessments on sharepoint)

•

5.a. Study Aids changed to Guides and Handouts
b. The definition and description of IC will be added to the library website after “Mission Statement & Learning/Service Outcomes” this week.
c. Information about the library orientations will be added to the library website this week.
• 6.a. and b. Andy and Liz are going to find out how to add Library Orientations under Faculty & Staff / Forms & Services. They have developed an online form that can be filled out and submitted online.
• c. Rosalind has contacted Christine Park to see if a tour of the library and an orientation can be added to New Faculty Academy. I will let you know the result.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Each of our programs includes student learning outcomes that are appropriate to the program level in all the requisite areas. We call these our ISLOs and there are eleven of them. Each of our courses and our CSLOs has been mapped to at least one of these ISLOs in eLumen. The software generates reports that aggregates all the CSLO scores that map to each ISLO, so we are able to determine how well students are achieving each ISLO.

We aggregated the CSLOs scores from Spring 2008 to Spring 2012 and made several observations. For one, when the data was organized by the frequency of the raw scores, it showed that the majority of scores, almost 13,000 scores, were mapped to Information Competency-Critical & Creative Thinking. Upon closer examination of each CSLO that mapped to this ISLO, we found only X number of CSLOs that truly pertained to information competency. The remaining X CSLOs were oriented towards critical and creative thinking. Though information competency and critical thinking are certainly related, the SLO Committee believes that they bear enough distinction for the College make them two separate ISLOs. Our library faculty were consulted and they agree that it needs to be its own outcome (2 links – Librarian Meeting Agenda 10.2.12, Librarian Meeting Outcomes 10.2.13). We also want information competency to be assessed more frequently. There may have been so little assessment in this area because most faculty do not know how to teach this skill or require it in theirs assignments. Our librarian faculty do deliver bibliographic workshops at an average of so many per year (link) and they do assess those workshops (link)(also if they revise their website could put link here) (program assessment report 2012 and discussion questions, library orientation quiz

The frequency chart also showed that the ISLO ethical reasoning was assessed the least with only 44 scores in four years from X number of classes. This has been a topic of discussion in the SLO Committee (slo agenda 2.10.15, 3.10.15). The committee revised the definition of ethical reas

With the leadership of one of the faculty members who teaches philosophy, the Committee revised the definition of this ISLO (GE outcomes draft list in progress 2.10.15) because (have asked Cal Lopez for help). To get feedback from other faculty about the College’s current definition of this ISLO, two philosophy faculty members led a discussion about ethical reasoning as a professional development activity (link to agenda, sign in sheet). Once the College has
adopted a new definition of ethical reasoning, we will do more to work with the faculty to encourage them to assess this ISLO, learn to assess this ISLO, write program outcomes map to this ISLO.

Another finding of note, was that for the ISLO mathematical competency/quantitative reasoning, 61% of the CSLO scores were in the exemplary range. We found this odd since we know from other data generated by OIE that our students struggle in their math courses and often need several attempts at a course before they can pass. An explanation may be that since most of these CSLO assessments were conducted at the end of the semester, the majority of the scores came from students who were succeeding in the courses. Thus, we have asked our Math department to conduct some assessments before the end of the semester. The instructors may learn more about what is needed to help retain more students and the ISLO results may be different. All of the concerns above will be addressed and remedied as the SLO & Assessment Committee leads the campus through a review, discussion and revision of our ISLOs this fall. We submitted a proposed list to EPPIC and the Academic Senate Executive Committee in spring 2015 (link slo committee ge proposal, proposed list to senate exec committee).

A survey was administered to the students who attended graduation practice in 2013 and in 2014 asking them how well LACC prepared them to achieve our ISLOs (link to actual survey questions). In spring 2013, 169 students took the survey and in spring 2014, 177 students took the survey. Survey questions were actual wording in the definition of our ISLOs. The number of students taking the survey was disaggregated by ethnicity (chart). Results showed that students on a Likert scale of 1-no preparation and 5-excellent preparation, for each statement, mean equal to our greater than 4.1. Thus, students’ perception was that LACC was preparing them at an above average level in all ISLOs. These results are in agreement with those from the 2015 LACCD Student Survey which are that students are aware of learning outcomes for their program (78%) and agree that their studies have increased their ability to write and speak clearly and effectively (72%), think critically and analytically (75%), solve numerical problems (63%), and understand people of other racial, cultural, or ethnic backgrounds (75%).

ISLO results since 2012

**Standard II.A.12.**

The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include a student’s preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**
Faculty developed rationale for general education

- The College has a general education philosophy statement for its associate degree that is stated in the catalog (Catalog, p. 23)
- The statement was developed by faculty in the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee and approved by the Academic Senate (April 2, 2015, Minutes)
- The College has identified institutional learning outcomes (link to ISLOs)

How SLOs are used to analyze courses for inclusion as general education

- CT’s response – we have not used SLOs to determine the appropriateness of a course for inclusion in general education. Do we have any criteria established to do this? If so, where is it written down? If we already have a process in place to determine the appropriateness – seems straightforward to add SLOs as a criterion. When was the last time an existing courses or a new course was deemed appropriate for gen ed? Info from other schools that DO have an application process for proposing a course for inclusion in gen ed; michigan’s app process (see #6 and #7 on p. 2)

How the general education philosophy is reflected in degree requirements

- General education is required to earn an associate’s degree (Catalog, p.x).

Analysis and Evaluation:

Our associate degree philosophy tells of the specific skills and knowledge gained upon completion of the associate degree (catalog, p. 23). The philosophy was developed by faculty in the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, approved by the Academic Senate on April 2, 2015 (link to minutes), and subsequently approved by the College president. To complete a Plan A degree, students must complete a minimum of 30 semester units total in general education, with specific unit requirements in each of five areas: natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, language and rationality, and health and physical education (catalog, p. 26). For a Plan B degree, a minimum of 18 semester units in general education is required (catalog, p. 28). Most students (73%) agree their studies have helped them acquire a broad general education (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #25a).

The college has 11 ISLOs that include the knowledge, skills, and abilities included in the list of required outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCJC SLOs</th>
<th>LACC’s ISLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student’s preparation for and acceptable of responsible participation in civil society</td>
<td>#7 Ethical reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#9 Interpersonal interaction and community participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#10 Intercultural knowledge and exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#11 Discovering global issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SLO & Assessment Committee will lead the campus through a review, discussion and revision of our ISLOs this fall. In May 2015, the Committee presented EPPIC with a draft of their ISLO revisions (SLO Committee ISLO GE Proposal 3.10.15). This draft was developed after X amount of time deliberating and studying the LEAP outcomes, the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP), and the ACCJC Standards (link to minutes, revision docs). The Committee proposed that the College organize our ISLOs into five areas of learning that contain 11 specific ISLOs. Four of the five areas of learning speak to what students learn in their general education studies. See chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCJC GE SLOs</th>
<th>SLO Committee’s Proposed GE Areas of Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student’s preparation for and acceptable of responsible participation in civil society</td>
<td>Global Learning &amp; Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills for lifelong learning and application of learning</td>
<td>Intellectual Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences</td>
<td>Lifelong &amp; Applied Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad &amp; Integrative Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth area, Specialized Knowledge, address the specific SLOs in a student’s major field of study. So, that when a student earns a degree from LACC, he/she should have acquired a certain level of proficiency in each of these five essential areas of learning. This fall, all campus stakeholders will have the opportunity to join in the SLO Committee’s draft and in the discussion and final versioning of the college’s new ISLOs.

*How SLOs are used to analyze courses for inclusion as general education*

**Distance education.** The College currently (Fall 2015) offers the following general education courses in DE mode: English 101, 102, 103, 211, 219, 270, Anthropology 101, 102, Math 227, Music 111, Chicano Studies 7, 8, 44, Political Science 1, Art History 120, Economics 1, 2, Linguistics 2, Computer Science 103, Family and Consumer Studies 21, Health 2, 11, and Business 1 (Fall 2015 schedule of classes). These courses meet both the CSU general education
plan and fulfill IGETC requirements, and part of the rationale for offering these courses in DE mode is to help students meet these requirements. In the 2013 DE Substantive Change Proposal to the ACCJC, the College argued that DE courses increase access and success by satisfying student demand, giving students more options to receive college credits, and improving the likelihood of degree and certificate completion. As with its traditional courses, LACC’s DE courses are transferrable to the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) as well as private four-year colleges and universities. Furthermore, increasing enrollment in online courses suggests unmet demand (DE Plan, Appendix B, p.X). Most LACC online students reside within its service area and concurrently enroll in on-campus classes to increase the number of units they can take each semester to complete their degree and transfer requirements (Traditional/DE College Profile, p. 2). In addition to meeting the needs of on-campus students, DE classes provide access to instructional programs for non-local, international, disabled, high school, and senior citizen students.

The College communicates its philosophy on offering general education courses via DE in its Catalog: “Courses in the general education pattern are offered on-site and many are offered through distance education, providing students with multiple opportunities to reach their educational goals.” (Catalog, p.X).

The prerequisites for DE courses are the same as for traditional courses, so DE students must have the same skill level as traditional students. DE sections of a course have the same SLOs as the traditional sections, therefore, they meet the same standards and rigor. DE courses are assessed in the same way as traditional courses to determine if students completing general education courses in the DE mode attain the required skills.

**Standard II.A.13.**

All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based upon student learning outcomes and competencies, and include mastery, at the appropriate degree level, of key theories and practices within the field of study.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- All include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core (LACCD District Board Rule 6201.10, Catalog, pp. X-X; State PRAP table)
- PNPR
- All have PSLOs that are statements of the core skills, performance abilities, attitudes, and/or values that students should possess at the completion of an entire course of study (PSLO Assessment Handbook p. 6, PSLOs for Instructional Programs)
- Original curriculum maps
- All have curriculum maps that identify the courses and CSLOs where PSLOs are mastered (Curriculum Map for each program, organized by department)
- All analyzed their curriculum maps and create an action plan, if necessary (Part 3 Degree Analysis and Action Plan for each program, organized by department)
- Description of liberal arts degree (not in catalog!)
- How courses got chosen for liberal arts degree (need documentation)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Per a LACCD Board Rule, to earn an Associate Degree or an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), students must complete a minimum of 60 semester units of course credit in a selected curriculum with at least 18 semester units of study in a major or area of emphasis (District Board Rule 6201.10). LACC offers X Associate Degrees and fourteen ADT degrees with each including focused study in an area of inquiry (Catalog pp. 39-40).

The identification of the specialized courses for a degree is done by the faculty in the discipline when they submit a Proposed New Program Request Form to EPPIC, which then must be approved by the Curriculum Committee (PNPR). Faculty members, in consultation with the Articulation Officer and with approval of the Curriculum Committee, may add or remove courses when requirements at transferring institutions change (evidence – is there a process doc for this?).

All degree programs have established PSLOs that describe the core skills, performance abilities, attitudes, and/or values that students should possess at the completion of a course of study (PSLO Assessment Handbook p. 6). Mastery of a PSLO is shown when students master the CSLO(s) that map to that PSLO. This relation between CSLO(s) and PSLO(s) is identified in the curriculum maps completed by the faculty within each program. Our first maps were completed on paper as Microsoft Word documents in 2011-12 (link to examples-need to scan some pick ones with many faculty signatures). After mapping, faculty analyzed their maps and if necessary, wrote action plans to revise courses or the program to address issues such as gaps in the instructional program, PSLOs that needed more attention, and sequencing of courses (Part 3 Degree Analysis and Action Plan for each program, organized by department, link to examples where a discipline decided to add a class because they saw that they needed more attention to a program SLO). Recently, eLumen’s capabilities improved, so within eLumen, faculty identified the relation between courses and CSLOs to mastery of PSLOs, resulting in downloadable curriculum maps (Curriculum Map for each program, organized by department). Faculty will continue to make these identifications as new CSLOs are written and PSLOs revised.

LACC offers one degree, the Liberal Arts AA degree with four interdisciplinary areas of emphasis: Arts and Humanities, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Performing and Visual Arts, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. This degree requires the completion of general education requirements, eighteen units in an area of emphasis, and electives for a total of 60 units. Many faculty contributed to mapping their discipline’s courses to the Liberal Arts PSLOs (link to list). How did these courses get chosen to be electives for the Liberal Arts degree?

**Standard II.A.14.**
Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Verifies and maintains currency of employment opportunities and other external factors

- All Career Technical Education programs have advisory boards to review programs and make recommendations to change curriculum to ensure it meets external standards (link)
- CTE departments that prepare students for external licensure and certification are externally accredited (evidence?)

How competency levels and measurable SLOs are determined – role of faculty and advisory committees

- Faculty write the CSLOs and PSLOs to meet the expected technical and professional competencies (CSLO/PSLO Assessment Handbook, p.X)
- All CTE programs are assessed as part of program review
- Program assessment results for CTE programs (Rad Tech’s program assessment plan)
- Pass rate for students taking the nursing exam, rad tech exams etc… (show that the students who graduate are prepared for certification/licensure)
- Our Coop-Ed program has internships for students in CTE programs and those students get evaluated by their “employer” (internship supervisor – ask Juliana Medina)
- Role of faculty…?? Alex Davis?
- All CTE departments are required to have advisory committees (Alex Davis—is there a Perkins document somewhere that requires this?)
- CTE departments take minutes at their advisory committees (Alex Davis—do they all do it?)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College offers 74 vocational certificates and degrees (Catalog). All CTE certificates and degrees have PSLOs that were developed by the faculty teaching in the program, as described in detail in Standard II.A.3. Instructions in the Handbook on Program Level Assessment state that PSLOs should include the technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards, the discipline’s ethical issues and standards, and any learning outcomes endorsed by relevant state and national organizations. These PSLOs are regularly assessed according to a program’s 5-year assessment plan.

All CTE programs have advisory boards that meet at least once a year (sample minutes). Advisory boards consist of actively working professionals in the field and industry, successful alumni, and faculty members from LACC and other schools of higher education (membership of advisory boards). They make recommendations on outcomes that need mastery in order for graduates to find work in the industry, resulting in the department making appropriate changes to the curriculum. Faculty involved with CTE programs are either working professionals or have
maintained strong ties to the industry of their field. Faculty members have the opportunity to attend local and national field specific conferences and workshops, at which they learn about the latest industry standards.

CTE departments that are externally accredited are expected to document advisory board outcomes as part of their accreditation process. For example, Dental Technology reviews comparative data on RGCDT exam results with its advisory board, and Radiologic Technology evaluates students based on assessments of trainings that are shared directly with its advisory board. All CTE programs assess certificate and degree production and outcomes as part of comprehensive and annual program review.

Vocational departments assess whether students are meeting employment standards through the results of external licensure and certification exams:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologic Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Alex Davis to make this easier to read]

Through updates to the course outlines of record, the department updates curriculum and learning outcomes and ensures that textbooks are current and cover the appropriate material.

Several vocational programs offer student internships. Dental Technology’s internship program is part of the curriculum, whereas other programs such as Journalism and Business offer internships on campus.

All departments offering certificates and degrees review them regularly through program review. As part of the most recent annual program review, units with low performing degrees and certificates were asked to explain how they would increase student success. Of the 22 programs reviewed, four were proposed to be discontinued and the remaining programs now have planning objectives towards improved outcomes (ESMP Degree and Certificate Accountability).

Although the majority of students (88%) agree that the courses required in their program prepare them for further coursework, employment, or transfer (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015,
Only 55% of students feel they acquire job or work-related knowledge and skills (#25b). [??]

**Standard II.A.15.**

When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- The College has a process to discontinue programs ([Request to Review the Next Steps for the Continuance/Discontinuance of a Program](#)).
- The College has a process to make arrangements so that students may complete their education in discontinued programs ([Program Viability Review Process, p.3](#)).

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

District policy states that “in making a recommendation for program discontinuance, a viability review must consider the following: 1. the effects on students and student success if the program is discontinued; and 2. provisions that can and should be made for students in progress to complete their training” ([LACCD Board Rule 6803.10](#)). At LACC, viability review is conducted by EPPIC. The process is directed by the Academic Senate and begins with the unit identifying the reasons for initiating the discontinuance of the program ([Request to Review the Next Steps for the Continuance/Discontinuance of a Program](#)). A viability study may be recommended ([Program Viability Review Process, p.3](#)). If the program is discontinued, during the two year phase-out of a program, existing students enrolled in the program are contacted. Those students are allowed to complete required courses within a two year period. If appropriate, the College facilitates the process of transferring students to other community colleges within the District to finish the program. No new students are admitted into the program once the recommendation to discontinue has been approved by the Academic Senate.

**Other info to describe:**

- **Between December 2009 and March 2012, 17 programs were archived.** (explain reasoning behind this). Find out how many since then.
- **In September 2015 the Architecture program was discontinued** ([link to Senate resolution](#)). Find out if any had students in them who needed assistance to complete the program. Business, perhaps?

**Standard II.A.16.**

The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

How the College evaluates the effectiveness of its courses and programs

- Departments collect assessment data for approximately 25% of their offered courses each semester and those that offer a degree or certificate will assess one program outcome for each degree or certificate each year (Academic Senate Resolution 02-S14 Student Learning Outcomes and Service Outcomes Assessment Policy)
- All instructional programs are required to participate in annual and comprehensive program review (Unit Planning Objectives)
- All instructional programs use student achievement data as part of program review (ESMP Data Sets)

Criteria and consistency for program review

- Requirements are articulated in the program review templates that units use to engage in program review (link to CPR interface 2012-13, Annual Update 2013-14, Annual Update 2014-15, and Annual Update 2015-16)
- The College assesses the results of program review, including a documentation of all units that engaged in the process (link to CPR 2012-13 Results, EPPIC Program Review Summary 2014-15 and EPPIC Program Review Summary 2015-16)

Data used in program evaluation

- SLO assessment results (ST1A.3 Latest SLO Report)
- Data is used in annual program review (Annual Update Data Sets)
- Data is used in comprehensive program review (CPR Data Sets)
- Student achievement is assessed annually (ST1A.4 ESMP; ST1A.5 ESMP Implementation Grid; ST1A.6 Summary of Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards—to be written)
- Curricular review
  - As part of program review (Program Review, Part 3, Curriculum Assessment), units use an assessment of data to justify any plans to change curriculum, including archiving, creating new, and modifying courses and programs
- Review of programs in overall curriculum
  - In comprehensive program review, all units are required to review their unit mission and explain how that mission supports and relates to the College mission (link to question in 2012 CPR document)
  - In program review, all units review access and success measures for all courses, degrees, and certificates, and create unit planning objectives that support the ESMP goals of access and success
  - Pre-collegiate programs align their curriculum with college level curriculum to ensure pathways for students (see Standard II.A.4)
Results used in institutional planning

- The ESMP is in part developed based on an evaluation of the results of program review for the previous six years (Integrated Planning Handbook, Appendix E)
- Through program review, programs create unit planning objectives to support ESMP objectives (link to program review analyses and unit planning objectives)
- As part of the annual assessment of the ESMP, committees review unit planning objectives related to the committee’s ESMP responsibilities and identify additional actions needed to improve college performance on the ESMP objective/strategy (link to Committee SharePoint ESMP Oversight)
- Changes/improvements resulting from program review
  - Discontinuance of X certificates between 2009-15
  - Discontinuance of Architecture program in 2015
  - Discontinuance of Athletics program in 2010
  - List others

Analysis and Evaluation

All instructional programs are required to participate in program review, which is designed to evaluate the quality and currency of programs. As part of program review, instructional programs review their outcomes assessment results and student achievement data and generate unit planning objectives. These programs are:

| Collegiate | Art and Architecture, Business Administration, Chemistry and Geophysical Sciences, Child and Family Studies, Cinema and Television, Communication Studies, Cooperative Education, Counseling, Dental Technology, English, Foreign Languages and Humanities, Kinesiology, Law and Administration of Justice, Library, Life Science, Mathematics and CSIT, Media Arts, Music, Nursing, Philosophy, Physics and Engineering, Psychology, Radiologic Technology, Social, Science, Theater Arts |
| Pre-collegiate | ESL, Learning Skills, select courses in Math and English, Workforce |
| Community education | Community Services |

For data used in comprehensive and annual program review, see Standard I.B.5.

The campus regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location through...
Annual and Comprehensive Program Review. Through this systematic and continuous process, the quality and currency of the campus’ programs are ensured. Through the SLO assessment process, the curricular review process, including five-year Title V course updates, and through Program Review, the campus systematically strives to improve and enhance its courses. As part of annual Program Review, each instructional department must complete a SWOC analysis (link to PR template), human resources assessment, and a review of past student achievement data. This ensures that Program Review is recursive and self-reflective.

Program Review utilizes a wide range of disaggregated and aggregated data such as course completion rates, retention rates, fill rates, and SLO results. Each program is also required to measure its success rates against the institutional set standards as well as the programs internal set standards, and if below these standards, each program is required to create a unit planning objective to address this deficiency.

The results of Program Review are used in the resource request process as well as the Hiring Prioritization Process for faculty. (link to HPC and resource request rubric form). For example, through the Program Review process, Media Arts (now called Visual and Media Arts) identified the need for a full-time faculty member in photography, and through the HPC process, this faculty member was hired for the Fall 2015 semester. (link to Marlos’ AUP). Another example is in the 2012-2013 Physics and Engineering Program Review, the department identified through the AUP process that a STEM program would increase student success in their department, and in Fall 2014, the STEM Academy was created. (link to STEM academy webpage). During the 2015 Faculty Symposium, a breakout session was hosted to further educate how the Program Review process is directly linked to resource requests and hiring (link to schedule for Flex 2015).

**Distance Education.** The campus evaluates the effectiveness of its course offered in DE mode in the same manner as traditional courses. The College does not offer any DE programs. DE courses are also reviewed by the DE committee to ensure effective course design, but courses are evaluated in Program Review by looking at disaggregated data between DE and traditional courses such as retention and completion.

The number of course offerings in DE has increased greatly over the last six years. With funding from a Title V grant, 22 faculty members developed 21 new online courses (two faculty members co-developed a course). As a result, the College now has the capacity to offer a fully online AA degree in Liberal Arts. Through a review of program review data, EPPIC is considering recommending the creation of a DE coordinator position for the campus (September 16, 2015 Minutes).

*Provide data from the PRE 2014 summary and EPPIC 2015 summary. Include data on compliance, status of plans, etc.*
Standard II.B. Library and Learning Support Services

Standard II.B.1.
The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to support educational programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education. Learning support services include, but are not limited to, library collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, learning technology, and ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

How library selects resources based on student learning needs

- Course outlines of record (Course Outline of Record, Section 7).
- Review of textbook list provided each semester by the College Bookstore, and discussions with faculty
- Review of reading lists and syllabus

How we assess the effectiveness of the library

- The library engages in comprehensive and annual program review, which identifies student needs, assesses the effectiveness of the library, and results in unit planning objectives (link to CPR and Annual Program Review)
- All programs undergo program review, including learning support services. (link to CPR and Annual Program Review)
- As part of program review, the library reviews survey results (2014 Campus Climate Survey Results, Part I, III.1 (2014 Campus Climate Survey Results, Part I, III.3; 2014 Campus Climate Survey Part II; #15.4)
- The library reviews the results of internal surveys of students (Library Survey Summary—Barbara Vasquez to provide)

Depth and variety of library materials

- The College has a print and digital Library collection (Library website)

Library services for all students regardless of location

- Catalog and databases are available online to any currently enrolled student and all faculty and staff
- Library utilizes QuestionPoint, which allows for 24-hour access to a librarian for research needs

Other learning support services

Los Angeles City College Self Evaluation 2016
• **Tutoring Services**
• The College has 73 computer laboratories with 2,001 computers (Technology Resources Plan, Appendix B, p. X)
• Additional areas using learning technology
  - Trio: laptop loaners
  - EOPS: Surface pro loaners
  - CalWORKs iPad loaners
  - Bridge to College
  - Laptop loaners (coming soon)
  - Will buy Computer cart with laptops for Hollywood High students
  - Technology to assist LA High Tech students in the following departments:
    - Cinema/TV
    - CSIT
    - Graphics Arts
  - OSS iPads loaners
  - Business Administration iPads for student surveys and other things

Comparable services for DE students
• DE students have access to library and learning support services that are comparable to traditional students ([Distance Learning Program website](link))
  - Catalog and databases are available online
  - QuestionPoint allows for 24-hour access to a research librarian
  - OSS/DSPS accommodations for DE students ([OSS/DSPS](link))
  - Online orientation will be ready for student use by summer 2015
  - Online tutoring will be available by the end of spring 2015 semester
  - The College has services to support students with specific needs or goals including: international students; welfare participants; transfer and career; English, Math, and Basic Skills; child care; disabled students; foster youth; low-income; first generation; under-represented students; caregivers of children; in need of health and wellness support; first year students; and veterans ([Student Services website](link))

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College Library is open six days a week for a total of 58 hours, including the reference desk and access to computers. The building has a seating capacity of 841. The number of visitors increased 10% between 2008 and 2014 with a decrease in 2014-2015 reflective of the college enrollment decrease ([link](link)). The average number of bibliographic instruction/library orientations given between 2008-2009 and 2014-2015 are 126 per year with an average of 4,055 students attending ([see table Barbara Vasquez gave you](link)). This instruction provides users of the library ongoing instruction. At least one librarian is at the reference desk during open hours. The librarians at the reference desk provide one-on-one bibliographic instruction with students. A reference librarian chat service is available 24/7 on and off campus. There are five full-time librarians; five library technicians who support circulation, periodicals, acquisitions, and cataloging; three instructional assistants/information technology employees who support the over
300 computers; Federal Work Study and CalWORKS student workers for approximately 230 hours each week who supplement student support for computers, printing, circulation, periodicals, and book processing; and one to six interns in Master’s of Library Science programs from local universities who provide additional service at the reference desk.

The Library has 192 computers for students, 18 group study rooms, and two classrooms with 98 more computers. The Library has six coin-operated printers, eight coin-operated copiers/scanners, three scanners, 11 computers with JAWS and Zoomtext, 2 computers with Kurzweil, three CCTVs, and a microform reader/printer for student use.

The Library collection consists of print and digital materials. The physical collection dates from 1929 and includes 117,073 titles (150,200 volumes), 95 periodical subscriptions, 1,127 DVDs/CDs, and 2,077 textbooks on reserve. The virtual collection, which also supports distance education and outreach students, is available 24/7 on and off campus. This collection provides access to 188,000 eBooks and over 50 databases. The College has significantly increased its online eBooks from 18,000 in 2012 to 188,000 in 2015, primarily due to an added subscription from our Community College Library Consortium. Catalog and databases are available online to any currently enrolled student and all faculty and staff. Although some of the databases are discipline specific, many provide universal support and are designed to support the curriculum at two-year colleges, such as JSTOR, Lexis-Nexis Academic, and Academic Search Premiere. The library also utilizes the service, QuestionPoint, which allows for 24-hour access to a librarian for research needs. The library is well equipped to provide services equally to all units on campus.

In addition to the LACC collection, students have access to public libraries and the Cal State LA collection. Statistics of database usage (link) and District intra-library loans are reviewed periodically (link).

Course and student needs are supported through the periodic review of course outlines, review of the required book list database in the College Bookstore, and discussions with faculty. All course outlines of record are reviewed by faculty members in the Library to request or purchase textbooks and review reading/writing assignments to determine how the Library can support students in the course (Course Outline of Record, Section 7).

The textbook reserve collection comes from instructor/student donations, donations from the LACC Foundation, and purchases by the library. The textbook reserve collection includes approximately 80% of all textbooks required for courses.

The Library offers numerous programs and services for students and faculty, including a Library Science 101 class, bibliographic instruction/library orientation workshops (data provided by Barbara), one-on-one reference desk assistance which is also done via phone, and training sessions to faculty (Opening Flex Days 2009-12). Through the Library website and at the Reference Desk, study aids, online tutorials for databases, and a list of helpful websites are available.
Other libraries on campus with a physical collection specific to individual departments include Child Development, Law/AJ, Music, Nursing, and Theater.

The College has numerous computer labs that are available to faculty, staff, and students (LACC Computer Labs). The campus currently has 1,853 computers housed in 36 different academic departments and student services areas.

Other support services include the Transfer Center, Counseling, Admissions and Records, Business Office, Health and Wellness Center, Career Center, English/ESL Writing Center, Learning Skills Center, Pi Shoppe, OSS, EOPS/CARE, Foster and Kinship Care, Guardian Scholars, TRIO, Veteran’s Affairs, Speech Clinic, Honor’s Program, Upward Bound, International Student Intensive Language Program, international student program, and first year experience supplemental instruction program. Other programs that provide tutoring to students include the High Tech Center, Guardian Scholars, TRIO, EOPS/CARE, CalWorks, Veteran’s Affairs, STEM program, Student Life peer to peer mentoring. (See chart in Standard II.A.7 for more details on these programs.)

A periodic faculty and staff survey identifies additional needs. The results of the most recent survey show that a majority of faculty and staff believe that the library’s collection is adequate to meet the needs of their program or work function (2014 Campus Climate Survey Part II; #15.4).

The major student learning support systems undergo program review, either through the academic department to which they are attached or as part of student service department to which they are attached. (link to program review). All departments with an attached learning support service such as the English/ESL Writing Labs must report on their efficiency in annual program review. (did we add this to program review template?).

An overwhelming majority of the campus feels that the College identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through diverse programs and services (2014 Campus Climate Survey Results, Part I, III.1), and that these services and resources effectively contribute to student success at LACC (2014 Campus Climate Survey Results, Part I, III.3). An overwhelming majority of the campus feels that the College identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through diverse programs and services (2014 Campus Climate Survey Results, Part I, III.1), and that these services and resources effectively contribute to student success at LACC (2014 Campus Climate Survey Results, Part I, III.3).

Students are satisfied with the Library (84%) (LACCD Student Survey Results, 2015). Employees agree that the Library’s collection is adequate to meet needs of their program or work function (2014: 74%; 2015: 75%) and say that they regularly use Library and related services to support their teaching or work function (2014: 51%; 2015: 52%). Employees overwhelmingly agree that Reference Librarians effectively contribute to student success (2014: 80%; 2015: 80%). They agree that Library resources contribute to student success, including computers (2014: 87%; 2015: 87%), computer labs (2014: 70%; 2015: 72%), study rooms (2014: 80%; 2015: 79%), printed material (2014: 76%; 2015: 78%), and orientations (2014: 79%; 2015:
Employees agree that students regularly use the Library to develop skill in information competency (2014: 57%; 2015: 55%). (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014 and 2015.)

Although College employees refer their students to student tutors (2014: 59%; 2015: 64%), Learning Skills Center (2014: 58%; 2015: 56%), and ASG for student support services (2014: 48%; 2015: 52%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014 and 2015), only 48% of students are satisfied with tutoring services (LACCD Student Survey Results, 2015).

**Distance Education.** All Distance Education students have equal access to library resources, including fully digital databases, reference materials, and librarians, 24/7. These services are also open to all off-site students. Learning support services are flexible in using email and phone meetings to ensure service to DE students. Supplemented digital materials are available from different departments that support learning labs for DE students. Workshops are also available online. Counseling is available via online. All library services are available fully digitally and with no impediment to access for students. Learning support services are also available online for students, including the recently acquired MyNetTutor to allow for digital tutoring for all DE students.

**Standard II.B.2.**
*Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians, and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Processes that inform the selection of educational equipment and materials to support student learning

- Identification of educational equipment and materials occurs through the program review and planning to budget process (*link to program review outcomes with prioritized resource request list*)
- The library and all other learning support service units identify educational equipment and materials which occurs through the program review and planning to budget process (*link to program review outcomes with prioritized resource request list*)
- The library reviews course outlines of all new curriculum updates to ensure that the library has the necessary resources for each class (*link to section 7 of course outline*)

Other ways the College assesses effectiveness of equipment and materials, and sufficient depth and variety of materials

- The library administers and assesses student surveys to ascertain any needed equipment and services (*link to surveys—Barbara Vasquez to provide*)
- The District and Campus Climate Surveys ask for specific feedback on the library and other learning services and their needs. (Link to surveys?)
- As part of program review, departments with attached learning support services request additional equipment as determined by the department in the assessment of their needs. (*link to program review*)
Analysis and Evaluation:

Educational equipment needs are identified by campus units through the planning to resource request process, which ensures that requests are aligned with ESMP objectives and the College mission. As part of program review, units review their educational equipment needs in support of their unit planning objectives. Requests are then prioritized based on how well unit planning objectives help the campus implement the ESMP. This ensures that all learning support units have quality, quantity, variety, and depth to their equipment.

As an example, Library equipment needs are identified through program learning outcomes assessments, instructional assistant reviews of equipment performance, internal documentation of the age of equipment in the Library Plan, and direct requests from students. Learning support materials needs are identified by faculty in the course outline of record submitted to the Curriculum Committee (Course Outline of Record, section 2). As part of the process, the Library Department Chair reviews course syllabi, reading lists, and assignments and forwards this information to the Acquisitions Librarian. Once a year all faculty are asked via email to provide a list of supplemental materials (link). The Library also examines Bookstore textbook lists and purchases selected textbooks for the Reserve Collection. Equipment and materials needs are discussed at monthly district discipline committee meetings with library chairs (link).

A periodic faculty and staff survey identifies additional needs. The results of the most recent survey show that a majority of faculty and staff believe that the library’s collection is adequate to meet the needs of their program or work function (2014 Campus Climate Survey Part II; #15.4).

Through program review, the Library and other learning support services determine if they have sufficient quantity, quality, depth, currency, and variety in their resources and whether those materials are sufficient to meet the learning needs of our students. The learning support unit then writes unit planning objectives, which align with ESMP objectives and include supporting equipment and materials needs (2014-15 Unit Planning Objective Updates). Resource requests are submitted (2015 Unit Resource Requests) and prioritized by the Budget Committee based on alignment with ESMP objectives (2015 Resource Request Reviews).

Faculty and staff agree that the Library’s collection of books, periodicals, electronic databases, and other resources is adequate to meet the needs of their program and learning needs of their students; they advise their students to use the library and other learning support services; and they believe that these services contribute to student success (2014 Campus Climate Survey Results, Part I, III.4.5).

Our library exceeds the requirements of Title V in terms of the number of books and databases on site based on the FTES of the College (link to Title V). (link to surveys with number of books/databases—Barbara Vasquez to upload)

OSS. Through external grants the High Tech Center and alternate media department has expanded its assistive technology offered to students. Technology includes iPad and iPod touch
with studying apps, screen readers and magnifiers, talking microscopes and scientific calculators, text to speech, audio music notation, videophones, wide screen monitors, CCTV magnifiers, tactile graphics, and Smart Pens to sync audio recordings of lectures to classroom notes. Students are provided specialized technology trainings. Future expansion will occur through the Student Equity Plan, focusing on increasing basic skills math completion, transfer, and degree and certificate completion.

**Distance Education.** The library is made aware of the courses taught through the DE mode, and the reviews any DE addendum to ensure that the library has the appropriate materials for a DE student. The library maintains a large digital collection of materials from reference books to periodicals. The library recently acquired licensing to share 20,000 videos and movies, which is most effectively used in a DE course. Through anecdotal evidence shared in conversation with learning support services from instructors, the library and other learning support services learns what specific obstacles and strengths DE students possess on campus and plan accordingly.

The campus maintains a large database of online reference material, offers free wi-fi to students on campus, offers numerous computer labs for students to complete DE courses, and offers physical use of Cal State Los Angeles’ library for students who cannot physically make it to LACC.

The success rate in DE courses is increasing, which has correlated to the increased digital resources provided by student learning support services (link to program review data). Approximately, 850,000 searches of the digital databases occurred each year over the last two years (link to Barbara Vasquez data).

**Action Plan.** As part of the fall 2016 program review, the College will administer the Library survey to DE students.

**Standard II.B.3.**
The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services includes evidence that they contribute to the attainment of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Methods to evaluate the library and other learning support services

- Through surveys, providing input by faculty and staff (campus climate survey) and students (reference desk surveys, District student survey)
- PSLO assessment (link to unit’s page of assessment reports in SharePoint, link to assessment plan)
- Annual and comprehensive program review, which includes a review of data, identifies student needs and results in unit planning objectives (link to CPR and Annual Program Review)
• Learning support services engage in comprehensive and annual program review as part of their parent department, whether academic or student services (link to program review)
• Office of Special Services regularly evaluates its assistive technologies (Focus Group Meeting for Students who are blind or have low vision, July 21, 2015)

Evaluation of use, access, and relationship to student learning

• The library tracks daily the number of students who use the facilities (link to reports—barbara Vasquez)
• The library tracks the use of online databases (link to reports--barbara Vasquez)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Library is evaluated by several different methods. First, …. Second, the library assesses at least one PSLO each year, following its 5-year assessment plan (link to plan). Two of the library’s four PSLOs, are student centered and evaluate students’ ability to use library services to access information and to recognize the ethical and legal issues surrounding information retrieval and intellectual property (link to library PSLOs online). These PSLOs were first assessed in 2009 and again in 2012 (link to each report and discussion questions, implementation report). What about 2014-15????

Third, all learning support services engage in annual and comprehensive program review. As an example, the Library reviews data including library user surveys, which are used for service outcomes assessments (link); faculty/staff surveys (link)Title 5 minimum standards for staffing and resources; and learning outcomes assessments for the Library 101 course (link to eLumen report showing all library 101 assessments in history). Other data used for evaluation and improvement include the campus climate survey; general library survey (link to Fall 2010, Fall 2013, Fall 2014(?) results); reference desk survey (link to results compiled every three years); and reference desk student evaluations (link). Dialogue occurs in department meetings on database subscriptions to meet the changing needs of students (link to minutes) and librarians regularly send book purchase suggestions to the Acquisitions Librarian reflection requests of students (link to email examples). The faculty members in the department keep current via LISTSERVs, library professional journals and works, discussing issues at district discipline meetings, and receiving suggestions from faculty in other departments.

The Library compiles the results of SLO assessments, analyses of progress towards institutional priorities, analyses of strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/challenges, and previous program review recommendations (Validated Program Review) develops unit planning objectives in support of the ESMP (2014-15 Unit Planning Objective Updates), and then requests resources to support those plans (2015 Unit Resource Requests).

Various labs and other learning support services undergo annual program review alongside their parent department or unit (link to program review). Regardless of whether a unit is academic or student services, these units undergo program review.
Note from Walden: Dan, Angelica just collect data on math and English and Learning Skills learning labs. It might prove quite helpful to have her engaged in writing this section or at least interview her. Also add some things from the Basic Skills Plans that you just got

Distance Education:
The College does not have any DE programs. The campus does not evaluate DE courses or services in any different way than traditional courses/services. Many DE centric services are new to campus and have not had the chance to be evaluated. (maybe the DE plan will cover this?) Christine Tinberg and Emil Mubaraksin will run reports comparing success in DE courses versus traditional.

Standard II.B.4.
When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible and utilized. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance, and reliability of services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement. The institution regularly evaluates these services to ensure their effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Contracts that exist for the provision of library and learning support services

- The College provides MyNetTutor to allow for digital tutoring for all DE students (link—Dan Walden)
- The College has a contract with the Course Management System Etudes that is used to deliver DE content as well as enhance traditional courses (link to Etudes contract—Dan Walden).
- Student Health and Wellness Center: basic health and mental health services for students provided by Family Care, an affiliate of White Memorial Hospital. The LACCD holds the contract with Mosaic for several of the LACCD Colleges. A Dean of Student Services oversees the program in conjunction with Mosaic’s Heath and Medical Care Coordinator who is a licensed physician. Mosaic holds all licenses and professional certifications for medical and professional therapists and state licensing/certifications. (LACCD holds the contract; Student Health and Wellness Center)
- The Office of Special Services provides Sign Language Interpreters for classroom instruction and instruction required activities. The LACCD holds the contract with outside agencies to provide additional interpreter services for each college if the current staffing level, in any given semester, is not sufficient to cover all classes needing sign language interpreter services. (District Personnel Commission holds the contract.)
- TRIO: EUREKA contract (link)
- SARS contract (link)
Career related licenses for online access (KUDER) contract (link)

How the College evaluates and ensures quality of contracted services

- All units engage in program review, which may include an assessment of the effectiveness of contracted services (any evidence of this?)
- OSS evaluates its assistive technologies through student surveys (Unit SLO Assessment and Five Year Plans)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Library provides students with access to resources beyond the local library (link)
Students from any college in the Los Angeles Community College District can check out books from any other library in the District or request a book from another LACCD library sent to their local campus library. The District libraries have a policy for intra-library loans (link). The Library has a reciprocal agreement with California State University, Los Angeles that allows LACC students to check out materials at their location (Barbara has the signed contract). The State provides access to a group of databases and the Library’s membership with the Community College League allows discounts on pricing for the other databases provided (link to membership invoice). Although there is no formal agreement needed, the librarians routinely refer students to specific resources and locations of the Los Angeles Public Library system, as needed.

The campus also recently entered into a contract with MyNetTutor to pilot digital tutoring support for the campus. As this is a new contract, a means of evaluation will be developed and conducted in spring 2016.

**Standard II.C. Student Support Services**

**Standard II.C.1.**
*The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution.*

Each student support unit develops a comprehensive six-year plan designed to support the College mission. In addition, each unit completes an annual program review that supports the long term goals established in the unit comprehensive plan in support of the college mission statement. Student support services utilizes student satisfaction surveys, focus groups, pre and post assessment, and faculty/staff engagement to ensure that all unit outcomes, regardless of location or method of delivery, are of high quality and enhance the mission of LACC.

Each student support unit develops a plan that determines future goals and necessary resources, and is assessed throughout the academic year to determine program effectiveness, to identify strengths and challenges, successes, and areas for improvement. These goals are shared though
the Student Services Council and throughout the shared governance committee structure of the
college to ensure that each unit’s collaborates with the academic, support services, and
administrative services units in support of the college mission.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Los Angeles City College meet this standard. Support services are evaluated on a regular basis
utilizing both College and Unit designed surveys, assessments, student learning/unit outcomes,
and through the program review process that generates a Unit Request form documenting the
budgetary and human resource needs of each department to respond to the needs of the student
population served and the college mission. Through this process, LACC Student Services
ensures that student needs are being met in support of the college mission.

Means of assuring quality

- All student support service units engage in annual and comprehensive program review
  (Standard I.B.5).
- All Units engage in regularly assessing SLOs and/ or service unit outcomes (SUOs)
  (plans, reports).

- Comparison of Status of All Unit Planning Objectives: Current Student Services Unit
  Planning Objectives
- Analysis of Program Objectives: Student Services Program Results

Demonstration of supporting student learning

- LACC Map and Directory
- Online Student Advising
- Student Services Departments
- SLO/SUO assessment reports Student Learning/Unit Outcomes, Surveys, and Assessment
  Reports
- Student Services: Office of the Vice President of Student Services

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College assures the quality of its services by requiring that all student support services
engage in the annual and comprehensive program review process. These include Admissions and
Records, Assessment Services, CalWORKs, Career Center, EOPS, Financial Aid, Foster and
Kinship Care, General Counseling, Guardian Scholars, International Student Services, OSS,
School Relations and Outreach, Student Life and Leadership, University Transfer Center,
TRIO/SSS, and Veterans’ Affairs. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides program
level data for the program review analyses. (ESMP Data Sets 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16) The
data includes measures on the four goals of the ESMP: access, success, organizational
effectiveness, and resources. In addition, the College evaluates services and receives input from
faculty and staff through campus climate and student surveys.
Also, by requiring each unit to engage in the SLO/SUO outcomes assessment process, the College makes certain that its services are of high quality and support student learning. The units’ outcomes are aimed at helping the college achieve our ESMP Goals, particularly those of Access and Student Success: ESMP Goals

Annually, each unit completes an assessment report that includes data analysis and an action plan to support student learning (Assessment Reports and Action Plans). Outcomes are reassessed then units complete the Action Plan Implementation Report. For a thorough explanation of this process see Standard II.C.2.

The majority of employees (2014: 75%; 2015: 78%) agree that LACC offers programs, practices, and services that enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity, agree that LACC offers support services that contribute to the personal development of our students (2014: 88%; 2015: 89%), and agree that LACC offers support services that contribute to the intellectual development of our students (2014: 86%, 2015: 87%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

The majority of faculty, staff, and administration (2014: 64%; 2015: 72%) [Barbara Macz] agree that LACC provides sufficient services to meet student needs. An overwhelming majority of employees agree that student support services directly contribute to student success:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Services</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKS</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian Scholars</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Experience</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Center</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation - Assessment Office</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation - Student Assistance Center</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation - Orientation</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Special Services</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life, including Associated Student Government</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Center</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Veteran Resource Center

| 97% | 97% |

(Source: LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015)

### Distance education

All Distance Education support programs undergo program review through their parent unit or department. Any support service that has a DE component or is designed for DE undergoes systematic program review. All support services units follow district, state, and federal regulations regarding services to DE students. The DE committee also has a student support services representative to ensure that the needs of DE students are identified (Distance Education and Student Resources for Students).

The DE main page has a self-evaluation tools for students (Distance Education for Students). Moreover, the campus maintains an online orientation for all students, and the DE main page has a list of CMS tutorials designed to prepare students for use of the system (Tutorials). Distance education students are monitored by disaggregating course success rates from eLumen data. Notable, the Office of Special Services has a section dedicated to DE services within its home web page (Distance Education Procedures - Students with Disabilities).

The Campus offers online advising through the counseling department for all students, including DE students. All financial support services are available and accessible entirely through phone and Internet correspondence. The DE committee developed an Instructor’s handbook that includes evaluation of distance education courses (Distance Education Handbook for Instructors). Recently, the campus began piloting online tutoring for DE classes through MyNetTutor. The campus orientation is also available online (LACC Online Orientation). Once the new Student Information System goes live, students will be able to access their education plan online and increase access to online academic advice.

### Quality Focus Essay Plan

1.3.1 Assess student services to determine ways to be more student centered and welcoming. An additional method for evaluating the quality of student support services.

2.2.1 Complete seamless process for tracking completion of online orientation
2.2.2 Complete common assessment tool that is accessible online
2.2.3 Complete automated abbreviated educational plans
2.2.4 Complete comprehensive educational plans

Evaluating support services

Equitable access

The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

Admissions policies

2.1.1 Expand peer to peer mentoring Evaluating support services; Counseling/advising
2.2.3 Increase percentage of supplemental instruction (SI) in basic skills courses

[Wanner to write this]
Standard II.C.2. 
The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Assessment methods used

- All student support services units have identified outcomes (PDF of SLO Listing, program websites)
- Each unit is required to assess one outcome every year (Academic Senate Resolution 02-S14 Student Learning Outcomes and Service Outcomes Assessment Policy)
- Each program has a plan to assess one outcome every year (Assessment Plans)
- The College has a procedure to identify and assess these outcomes (Handbook for the Student Services Assessment Process)
- Annual Assessment Timeline(s) link
- Assessment Proposals are required to be submitted each year (Student Services-All Units-Assessment Proposals, 2013-14 and 2014-15 Assessment Proposals, by unit, by year)
- Sixteen student support services units have participated in outcomes assessment and 72% of the student support programs have completed two or more outcomes assessment cycles (Assessment participation report 2009-present, Assessment Reports by unit, Students Services-All Units-Assessment Reports by year)
- Student Services SLO Workgroup assists with creating processes and giving feedback to colleagues (Workgroup Meeting Notes, Workgroup Review of Proposals)
- Annual Student Services SLO Kick-offs (2014 agenda and presentation, 2015 agenda and presentation)
- Common Service Unit Outcome Survey Questions (SLO Workgroup minutes)
- Diagram-Relation of Outcomes Assessment to Fulfilling LACC’s Mission
- For annual program review, outcomes assessment action plans are used to create unit planning objectives (Unit Planning Objectives)
- Units review the following data sets as part of program review
  - Annual program review data sets (ESMP Data Sets 2014-15): Report of new and at-risk students receiving services; SSSP completion; applicants and assessment by feeder high school; high schools attended by first-time LACC students; student equity disproportionate impact analysis; Achieving the Dream outcomes (list improvements that have been made)
  - CPR data specific to service centered units (2012-13 CPR Service Centered Units)
  - CPR data specific to student centered units (2012-13 CPR Student Centered Units)
  - SLO section of 2012 Comprehensive Program Review (link)
• The SLO Committee reviews each assessment reports from each unit (2014-15 Review Assignments, 2014-15 Comments Review Program Assessments, Timeline Instructions Review Assessment Results Campus-Wide)

Results used to improve services
• Document improvement resulting from SLO assessments (Tinberg to run a report; will do for Student Services also)
• Student services programs complete an annual Implementation of Action Plan Report identifying improvements resulting from SLO/SUO assessments (Tinberg to summarize: evidence on SharePoint)
• As part of the 5-Year Assessment Plan, academic programs document implementation of action plans when reassessing CSLOs (Tinberg: evidence)
• All units have at least one unit planning objective based on an assessment of learning outcomes; through annual updates the units document actions taken and improvements in the associated measures (link to unit planning objectives page)

Analysis and Evaluation:

All student support service units have identified learning and/or service outcomes, which appear on their websites (TRIO/sss, Office of Special Services). Outcomes assessment in student support services begin in 2009 with three units participating and has grown so that in 2014-15, sixteen units participated and in 2015-16, eighteen units are expected to participate. In the future, it is required that all eighteen units assess at least one outcome each year, even during comprehensive program review (Senate Resolution 02-S14).

Between the fall of 2009 and spring of 2012, ten units each assessed one outcome. In 2012-13, two units that had not participated previously, each assessed an outcome. Then, in 2013-14, eight units that had participated once, participated in the cycle for a second time. (explain the growth – is this due to more areas being involved in program review? Christine needs help here – why were these units added? FYE is a “new program”, what about the rest like Upward Bound, Do we foresee any more units needing to be added to program review or are we done?)

In the past three years, the College has developed several practices to ensure that student support units receive adequate guidance and support to conduct a meaningful assessment cycle. The SLO Committee, working with the Student Services Council, wrote the Handbook for the Student Services Assessment Process (link). This Handbook is updated and revised as needed. Each unit follows the annual Assessment Timeline (link) that identifies specific dates for completing the assessment steps described in the handbook.

In fall 2014, the College held the first annual SLO Kickoff, specifically for Student Services, to commence the new assessment cycle (link). Presentations were given by campus leaders on the relation between outcomes assessment, the college mission, program review, and program
improvement. Units shared their assessment results from the previous year and worked on their proposals for the coming year (agenda). The second annual Kickoff was held in September 2015 and this time included instruction on entering assessment reports into eLumen (links). Since it proved beneficial for units to have a dedicated block of time to think about assessment and program improvement, we intend to continue having a Kickoff each year.

The Student Services SLO Work-Group was instituted in fall 2014. Student services faculty and staff make up this group providing feedback on the content of the assessment reports and identifying how to improve the division’s assessment process (link to charge doc). Last year, the work group recognized that many units were interested in assessing a customer service type outcome, so they created five survey questions that any unit can use (link). In October 2015, they reviewed all the assessment proposals and …….. (link).

Finally, SLOs are an agenda item at each Student Services Council meeting and the discussion is led by the Student Services representative(s) on the SLO Committee (link to agendas). Since the number of units participating in outcomes assessment has increased, student services saw the need for additional representation on the SLO Committee. So, in September 2015, the SLO Committee approved the addition of a second student services representative (link to minutes). This is important for succession planning and will increase the in-depth knowledge about assessment among student services.

Outcomes assessment is related to the College mission, the ESMP and the annual and comprehensive program review process. The assessment handbook describes the necessity of units’ program outcomes aligning with the College’s ESMP goals and objectives. It also tells of how outcomes assessment is a necessary component of program review because it is one way a program evaluates its quality and contribution to student success. In the 2012 comprehensive program review, units used rubrics to review their mission statements and their outcome statements. Then, they filled in a table with the action plan, the implementation status and the evidence. They updated their five year assessment plan, reflected on their strengths with the assessment process and told of actions they needed to take to improve their process (link to SLO section of CPR for a few programs). Our next comprehensive review will follow a similar format (handbook pages). In annual program review, assessments take their assessment results and action plans to create unit planning objectives (links).

Unit planning objectives need to be implemented in order to create change that helps students be successful. To track implementation, in August 2015, we added Step 14: Submit an Action Plan Implementation Report and Step 15: Share the Implementation Report to the handbook (link). These reports are to be completed after the plan has been implemented and the outcome reassessed (handbook). This requirement is retroactive, thus units completed reports for outcomes assessed in 2013-14 (link to reports).

With the creation of the practices described above, we are confident that we have the mechanisms in place for our units to assess measurable SLOs on a continuous basis.

Distance Education:
The campus does have state authorization requirements for students who take a DE course and are not California residents. The OIE tracks DE students and locations to ensure that state authorization has been reached. (District will provide list of students who are enrolled in a DE course and reside in a state with which we do not have authorization—still working out the details of this—wait to hear from Rocio and Will Marmolejo)

Since 2014, counselors have been assigned to provide online advisement and chat, in part to help meet the growing needs of DE students.

The Office of Special Services developed online procedures to accommodate students who have disabilities. Although this service has not been used extensively, it does provide a procedure to ensure reasonable academic accommodations for students enrolled in LACC online courses.

**OSS- Distance Education Accommodation Procedure**

**Action Plans.**
- For the fall 2016 program review, the College will develop a satisfaction survey instrument for DE students that includes questions on counseling and student support services. Students will be asked which support services they use and now often they use the support services. Survey results will be used to assess student need and result in improvement.
- By 2017-18 the College will attempt to allocate resources to hire a dedicated DE coordinator, who among their many other responsibilities will verify that student services support student success in DE courses.

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** 1.3.2 Identify and support at-risk students. *Additional way of identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes.*

  [Wanner to write this]

**Standard II.C.3.**
*The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.*

LACC provides a wide-range of student support services for all students. Under the umbrella of the Student Services Division, some of the available basic services include assistance with the college and financial aid application, campus orientation, assessment placement testing, academic counseling, career and transfer information, and student life. Specialized programs, such as CalWORKS, CARE, Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS), Guardian Scholars, Office of Special Services (OSS), TRIO, and Veterans Affairs, are available to a specifically targeted underserved student population. All student services units make their services available at the main campus. While most student services units are currently placed in several locations around campus, a plan is underway to house all student services program in the new Student Services building slated to open in spring 2016.
LACC strives to make the campus support services accessible to all students. All student services units maintain a web presence to make information accessible to students, regardless of their physical location. The college actively uses electronic communication and social media as a platform to disseminate information about the campus. Students enrolled in distance education have access most of the support services on-line. To accommodate the evening students, several student services units (e.g. Admissions & Records, Counseling, Financial Aid and Health and Wellness Center) remain open past their regular normal business hours. LACC is cognizant about the need to make the services available to students with disabilities by making an effort to make its website and printed materials accessible and available using alternative media, whenever possible. The college meets the World Wide Web Consortium’s (W3C) markup validation service requirements and complies with Section 508.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- All students who take LACC classes at locations other than the main campus are provided comparable services to traditional students through the availability of online resources (Distance Learning Program website; Assessment Services; Counseling; Transfer Program; Office of Special Services)

- On the left column of the main page of the college website, a drop down menu is visible to quickly link website users to all student services units

- Updates to the new Student Services Center is available on the Construction Updates section of the college website

- A link to the LACC Facebook as a social media platform is visible on the lower left section of the college website

- The Distance Education section of the college website provides information to distance education learners on how to access comparable support services available to traditional students

- Student Services Units (e.g. Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Office of Special Services) make their applications and forms available on-line and allow the submission of these forms by email, fax and regular mail.

- When available, the availability of services during evening hours is stated on Student Services unit webpage (e.g. Admissions & Records, Counseling, Financial Aid and Health and Wellness Center)

- LACC offers a general on-line college orientation and advisement that serves both traditional classroom and distance learners

- The LACC College Catalog is one example of a college publication where readers are made aware of the availability of alternative publication formats, as stated on page 9 of the document.

Analysis and Evaluation:

While LACC clearly meets the requirements of the accreditation Standard II.C.3, the campus continues to find ways to improve how it provides support services, regardless of service
location or delivery method. The building of a new Student Services Center is the first big step in making all support services available in one location. By relocating all of its support services in one main campus location, the student services units will have the opportunity to improve the coordination of services, leverage resources, and possibly provide uniform service hours that meet the needs of students.

In addition to its online advising, LACC has taken a positive step by making its on-line orientation available for all students. To fully meet the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) state mandates for all students including distance learners, the campus should strive to offer assessment services on-line. By offering assessment services on-line, distance learners will have the same opportunity as traditional classroom learners to meet SSSP mandates without stepping foot on campus.

The availability of forms on-line makes it possible for students to complete the required documentation to meet program requirements. To improve transparency on the methods on how students can submit a form, it would be highly recommended for each form to include the acceptable methods of submission (email, fax or regular mail) in the form instruction.

The campus strives to ensure that any service provided to traditional students on site are accessible in a comparable way to any DE student or student at a satellite location. LACC offers comprehensive support services, most of which are available on the main campus and off-line and evaluated in a meaningful way through the governance structure and unit meetings. Services available on the main campus include Admissions, Financial Aid, Counseling, Veterans, Assessment, Student Life, Transfer and Career. Specialized services include EOP&s, CARE, CalWORKs, TRIO, and OSS are available to students to strengthen educational opportunities for our students.

The Distance Learning Program’s website provides access to a comprehensive collection of online resources and meets the World Wide Web Consortium’s (W3C) markup validation service requirements and complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. The website includes the latest course schedules and a directory of online student services including:

- 24/7 Online Student Help Desk
- Etudes login instructions, video tutorials and FAQs
- Information about how to enroll in and add courses
- System requirements
- Online Student Orientation
- Schedules for online and hybrid courses
- Access to the Online Writing Lab and online tutorial services
- Pre-Assessment Questionnaire for new online students
- Online Student Success video
- A direct link to the College Bookstore website where students can access information regarding required and recommended course materials and purchase materials to be picked up on campus or shipped to their home or business
- Online library services
• Biographies, photos, and email addresses of online instructors
• Instructor resources
• College news and events
• Link to the main college website
• A Contact Us link
• Electronic access to the library catalog
• Remote access to periodical and research databases

Assessment Services for off campus students are available online (Assessment Services). The website includes:
• Scheduling assessment tests
• Practice tests
• Assessment testing schedule
• Online orientation

Online counseling is available for off campus students (Counseling). The website includes:
• Counselors and their contact information
• Hours, office location and FAQs
• Live online chat
• Online advising
• Online student transfer information system (ASSIST) link
• Associate Degree checklist
• California State University checklists
• University of California General Education checklists
• Counseling discussion board

Information on transfer is available for off campus students (Transfer Program). The website includes:
• Office location, hours and contact information
• List of transfer services and requirements
• Links to the Accelerated College Transfer (ACT) Program and the Transfers Honors Program
• Access to Transfer eChat, live chat with university representatives from Brandman University, Pepperdine University, Regis University, UC Los Angeles, UC Merced, CSU Dominguez Hills, CSU Los Angeles, CSU Northridge and many more.

Financial aid information is available for off campus students (Financial Aid). The website includes:
• Online application
• Office location, hours and contact information
• How to apply
• Eligibility requirements
• Types of aid
• Scholarships
- Board of Governors Grant (BOGG) fee waiver information
- Student loans
- How Financial Aid Works
- Forms
- Grant application deadlines
- Daily financial aid news

Disabled student programs and services are available for off campus students (Office of Special Services). The website includes:

- OSS Eligibility/Application for Services
- Eligibility & Intake
- Types of Services Offered
- Accommodation Services
- OSS Tutoring Services
- Learning Disabilities Services
- High Technology Center
- Alternate Text Production Center
- Specialized Counseling
- Sign Language Interpreting Policies
- Distance Education Accommodations Procedures
- Distance Education FAQ
- Information for New Students
- Important Links

**Implementation of Effective Practices as Defined by ACCJC:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTIVE PRACTICES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increase students’ understanding of admission requirements, application, and financial aid processes. | 1. The new on-line orientation informs students about the college admission and financial aid process.  
2. The college has obtained the services of Financial Aid TV to inform students about financial aid policies and procedures in audio-visual format. |
| Develop dual/concurrent enrollment opportunities for high school students. | 1. LACC currently offers a sizeable number of college level courses at the local high schools.  
2. As part of the GEAR UP partnership and Upward Bound program, the campus provides opportunities for underserved high school areas to enroll in college level courses. |
| Permit students to take college placement | 1. As part of its new outreach and recruitment |
assessments, including assessment preparation activities, while in high school. Permit students to enroll in college directly from high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strategy, LACC has partnered with its local feeder high schools to offer assessments at the high school location.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Through its First Year Experience (FYE) initiative, LACC has invited newly high school graduates to visit the campus for a one-stop academic advising, orientation, academic planning, financial aid support, and course registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End late application and registration before classes begin.</strong></td>
<td>1. The LACC Outreach and Recruitment team encourages high school students to submit their college and financial aid application early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The FYE initiative provides a campus infrastructure and support for incoming college freshman to register early prior to the start of the term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distance Education.** The Campus provides reliable and comprehensive services entirely online: Orientation, tutoring (future pilot program), counseling advisement, and uses the Etudes CMS to ensure that all materials are delivered in a stable and easy to navigate manner.

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** 1.3.3 Increase communication with enrolled students, especially through social media. *Increases equitable access to all students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to ALL students. Recognized that we’re not communicating as well as we could to all our students*

1.3.4 Fully implement the SSSP Plan (See Objective 2.1). Complete our planning activities; Expand equitable access

Measure: Expand FYE to 1,000 students and City Pathways College to 500 students

2.1.1 Complete seamless process for tracking completion of online orientation
2.1.2 Complete common assessment tool that is accessible online
2.1.3 Complete automated abbreviated educational plans
2.1.4 Complete comprehensive educational plans

**Evaluating support services**

**Equitable access**

*The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.*
Admissions policies

[Wanner to write this]

Standard II.C.4.
Co-curricular programs and athletics programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. If the institution offers co-curricular or athletic programs, they are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The institution has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their finances.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Student Clubs [ASG]
Book Program
Music Concert Series
Theater Performances
Cinema/TV Showings
Dance Program
Collegian
Forensics Team
Math Competition Team

All are aligned with existing programs.
ASG has a finance committee
All departments that raise funds have an internal trust account
Theater ticket sales go to the Business Office
Donations to music and cinema events are direct donations to the Foundation

• The College does not offer athletics programs

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College’s co-curricular programs compliment the existing curriculum. Any funds raised from performances are _____.

In 2010 the College engaged in a co-curricular viability study (2010 Co-curricular Viability Study). The purpose was to examine the feasibility of co-curricular programs from a funding perspective. The analysis provided the College with a local definition for co-curricular activities. LACC does not have an athletics program or any other program that would qualify as co-curricular.
In early 2015, an Academic Senate viability review on Athletics determined that the program would be viable, but the process to return any program would take substantial time. ([link to viability report](#))—make sure President’s response is included in the viability report link

**Standard II.C.5.**
The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. Counseling and advising programs orient students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- The College has 19 full-time counselors: 9 in general counseling; 4 in EOPS; 3 counselor coordinators for Transfer, Career and International services respectively; 1 in TRIO; 1 in CalWORKs; and 1 in OSS. The College also has two grant-funded adjunct counselors in Nursing and Child Development and 1 counselor supporting outreach funded by SSSP.
- The College is working to follow the Title 5 ratio of 1 counselor for 900 students. ([Title 5, section 58732, Credit Student Services Standards](#)]. The full time equivalent faculty (FTEF) for general counselors is 9.1. In the Fall 2014, LACC had 18,213 students for a ratio of 1 counselor for every 2,001 students.
- Online advising and live chat are available to all students ([link](#))
- Counseling sessions include: educational planning, evaluation of transcripts, review of transferability of courses, degrees, and certificates; major preparation; prerequisite checks; academic progress; among a number of other topics
- In compliance with SSSP, the College requires that all incoming students take Math and English assessments, attend orientation, and develop an educational plan with a counselor. GET THE DATE FROM Emil Mubarakshin. ([data on # of assessments; data on # of orientations/ed plans= Will Marmolejo;](#))--So, we require it but do not enforce it. Data showing the difference should be displayed and plans for interventions to fully comply should be explained. FIGURE OUT A BETTER WAY TO WORD THIS--ask Dr. Smith for an honest way to say this.
- The Counseling Department offers classes that encourage personal development for students, including Counseling 40: College Success. ([link to course description in Catalog](#))
- FYE (First Year Experience)
- The Student Health and Wellness Center provides mental health counseling and related psychological services for LACC students and in-service training for students, faculty, and staff ([Life Skills Center Program](#)) Ask Randy Anderson how many faculty/students participate
- Students learn about general education and major requirements during orientation and counseling sessions ([link to orientation PowerPoint; link to IGETC, CSU, Plan A, and Plan B sheets on the counseling website](#))
- Graduation policies are communicated to students in the Catalog and schedule of classes ([find pages](#)).
Transfer policies are communicated to students through the Catalog and schedule of classes (find pages).

Counseling’s program outcomes assessment results and reports, organized by year

Analysis and Evaluation:

Title 5 section 58732, Credit Student Services Standards specifies program-based funding specifications. The state Academic Senate monograph, the Consultation Council Task on Counseling calculated that a ratio of 1:900 would comply with Title 5 standards.

Note from Walden: Several references have been made to Title 5. However, usually ACCJC trainings mention they are interested in compliance with the standard not compliance with Title 5. Perhaps it would be better to word how the college meets the standard.

In addition to providing academic counseling to students, counselors regularly attend annual conferences hosted by local universities (evidence: Ensuring Transfer Success flyer), including information on specific majors. Counselors also engage in webinars (evidence?). Some units have designated counselors, such as, First Year Experience, Guardian Scholars, and Honors Program, and Veteran’s as well as several academic departments. Counselors often attend department meetings to provide information on major and transfer options.

Unit managers and department chairs are invited to attend the counseling bi-monthly meetings, allowing the opportunity to provide information to the department on how to advise its students.

Counseling has consistently used the outcomes assessment process to evaluate their ability to orient students about academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies. On three occasions, counseling has assessed their program outcome, The student will outline the academic requirements associated with their educational plans. The first assessment occurred in spring of 2011 and had students who completed a one-on-one, thirty minute counseling session complete a pre/post survey. Results showed that students felt that their understanding of graduation requirements and how those aligned with their educational plans had improved after the session. But, flaws were found in the wording of the questions and the survey was deemed too long, so it was revised with help from OIE and used again for the 2013-14 assessment. This time, the survey was administered to students attending summer orientation. Overall, results again were positive. But, the program learned that not every counselor was using the PowerPoint presentation when delivering orientation sessions. Thus, they could not be certain that each counselor was covering the same information and all the information. They determined to update the slides and to ask all counselors to use the PowerPoint presentation. Last year, the survey was administered again and counselors noted that only 78% of students felt they had a clear understanding about balancing course load with personal needs and that only 77% of students responded that they had a clear understanding of the programs and services that would assist them with their academic goal. They planned to modify the technique, delivery, and scope of the information addressing these issues for future orientations. Also, they would consider designing a handout to give to students that recommends the unit loads based on extracurricular responsibilities.
During the 2014-15 academic year, the Student Health and Wellness center provided over 5,000 service contacts including behavior intervention, crisis counseling, etc., 748 of which were specifically mental health counseling sessions for students (Student Health and Wellness Center). The Life Skills Center Program has seen 60 students for individual counseling sessions for a combined total of 460 session hours 2014-15. The issues ranged from family, relationship, and self-esteem issues to more severe challenges such as anxiety, depression, suicidal ideation, and diagnosable mental illnesses. This is an increase of 40% over last year. Workshops for several departments on campus included topics on parenting, violence against women, anger management, student success skills, and emotional intelligence. Training, education, and support for faculty and staff on how to recognize, address, and refer at-risk and problematic/disruptive/challenging students with mental health issues have been provided:

- CARE – 6 workshops
- TRIO – 4 workshops
- EOP&S – 4 workshops
- Guardian Scholars – 2 workshops
- 1 Flex Day training () – 6- faculty members (F.M.)
- 1 Academic Senate meeting: Promoting & educating LSP services & BIT team- 30 F.M.
- 2 Psychology faculty meetings: Promoting & educating LSP services & BIT – 12 F.M.
- 4 Dept. Chair meetings: Promoting & educating LSP services & BIT – 30 F.M.
- 1 veterans orientation day presentation – 10 attending
- 2 Cal Works/Gain meetings – 4 staff/ administration attending
- 4 meetings w/ dean of student life
- 1 meeting w/ faculty of the Child Development Center- 4 faculty members
- 1 presentations & 1 workshop to Nursing program – 20 in attendance Life Skills Center Program.

Graduation. The College has a dedicated web page announcing graduation (Commencement web page). Graduation policies are included in the Catalog and schedule of classes (find pages). Dates to submit petitions for graduation are included on the online academic calendar (Important Dates). The Admissions Office sends students emails announcing dates to submit petitions for graduation (link to Sample Email Announcing Petition for Graduation—uploaded to site).

Transfer. Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public through the College catalog and schedule of classes. These policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer, including credit by exam (College Catalog, pp.213-14), credit for courses at non-accredited institutions (p. 214), and evaluation of foreign transcripts (p. 216).

The tenure review processes evaluates probationary counselors to ensure that each one is highly qualified and gives accurate information to students as does all faculty review processes as laid out in the AFT contract (link to article 42). The program review process also ensures that counseling and all support services undergo systematic and comprehensive review. This ensures that counseling and all other counseling services enhance student development and success through the assessment of success measures. Counseling also has classes (“Counseling,”
previously “Personal Development”) that undergo course SLO assessments and program learning outcomes assessment. *(Ask Christine Tinberg to give measures and assessments for counseling classes)*

**Distance Education.** The campus does have counseling classes available through DE; the campus has academic advisement that is available online for all students and orientation is available online for all students. The campus ensures that comparable services are available for all DE students as well as off-site students. Online counseling classes are evaluated to ensure that DE students are having their needs met through measuring success data such as persistence and course completion.

Since 2013, a counselor has been assigned to provide 24/7 online advising and online chat. The dedicated online counselor is provided training on how to use the online system *(online Counseling home page)*.

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.**

2.1 Complete seamless process for tracking completion of online orientation
2.1.2 Complete common assessment tool that is accessible online
2.1.3 Complete automated abbreviated educational plans
2.1.4 Complete comprehensive educational plans

*Evaluating support services*

*Equitable access*

*The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.*

**Admissions policies**

2.2.1 Expand peer to peer mentoring
2.2.3 Increase percentage of supplemental instruction (SI) in basic skills courses *Evaluating support services; Counseling/advising*

2.3.1 Follow through on required Comprehensive Education Plans for students over 15 units (part of SSSP), with career exploration and declaration of a major; *Counseling/advising/ orientation*

2.3.2 Continuation of FYE support services in the second year (for full-time entering students, and for part-time students taking Math and English), with additional focus on support within the major including academic mentoring by faculty members through a faculty-student mentoring program; *Counseling/advising/ orientation*

2.3.3 Build and support cohorts for students in ‘signature’ academic transfer/degree/cert programs as identified in QFE Objective 1.1.4, such as STEM, performing arts, and allied health departments; *Counseling/advising/ orientation*

*[Wanner to write this]*
Standard II.C.6.  
The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. The institution defines and advises students on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificate, and transfer goals.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Admission policies
- The College admits any person possessing a high school diploma or its equivalent. The College follows District policies on admission of elementary and secondary students grades K-12 as full time and part time students; admission of highly gifted and talented students grades K-12 as special full time and part time students; admission and residence classification of non citizens; applicants for student visas; and residence requirements. (LACCD Board Rules, VIII.I.8100)

Pathways
- Students learn about pathways to complete degrees during orientation and counseling sessions (link to online orientation; link to orientation PowerPoint; link to IGETC, CSU, Plan A, and Plan B sheets on the counseling website)
- Students learn about pathways to complete certificates in the catalog (link). Counselors use the catalog to advise students on courses required to complete certificates.
- Students learn about pathways to transfer goals in the University Transfer Center, which has a designated counselor. The UTC website has information on articulation agreements and transfer requirements (link to website). The Center (AD-109) has many supporting resources including transfer university catalogs, workshops, campus tours, and university representatives.
- Transfer Day is held every fall semester, with an average of about 40-45 schools participating (link to Transfer Fair 2015 Sign In Sheet).
- In-person and online orientation covers transfer requirements, pathways for degree/certificates completion, and job-readiness programs (link to pages in PowerPoint and section in the online orientation that cover each of these)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The online application ensures that all students are eligible to enroll in the college, and this application is vetted through the admissions process. Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) mandates all incoming students receive assessment, orientation, and counseling. This ties in with student’s priority registration along with state funding to the college. Effective fall 2016, all students who have completed a minimum of 15 units must declare a major for further priority consideration.

The campus curriculum committee and the EPPIC committee routinely evaluate pathways to the completion of awards or transfer to ensure that students can efficiently achieve their educational goals (link to learning skills viability, high-unit certificate data). Programs with outside accrediting bodies and state/federal regulations also adhere to established regulations and
program design to ensure that all content is appropriate, thorough, and meets the needs of the job market/student.

The orientation process and counseling process ensure that students are aware of the courses that they must complete, their progress towards a stated goal, and their options in obtaining awards. All information is also posted and updated in the catalog, so all graduation requirements, transfer requirements, and awards requirements are available online at any time.

60% of students have been able to follow the recommended list of courses in their Educational Plan (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #20)…what to do with this relatively low number? Dr. Smith to provide information on the OEI statewide Initiative and District PeopleSoft.

Distance education. Online orientation is available for DE students.

Quality Focus Essay Plan.
Measure: All new students who are required to complete matriculation are assessed, complete orientation, complete the placement process, and develop an abbreviated or comprehensive student education plan
2.1.1 Complete seamless process for tracking completion of online orientation
2.1.2 Complete common assessment tool that is accessible online
2.1.3 Complete automated abbreviated educational plans
2.1.4 Complete comprehensive educational plans

Evaluating support services
Equitable access
The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

Admissions policies.
[Wanner to write this]

Standard II.C.7.
The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Processes used to evaluate the effectiveness of practices and tools of admissions and placement

- Accuplacer is used for placement prior to orientation (accuplacer.org)
- Accuplacer is accepted by the State Chancellor’s Office as an approved placement tool (California Community Colleges Approved Assessment Instruments, Spring 2015)
- Math and English sets the exam cut scores for entry into courses
o The SSSP Committee reviews Math and English cut scores for compliance with state requirements (find the minutes on SSSP SharePoint site; Will Marmolejo to send you the state requirements)

o Math component was validated (ask Math Dept for summary report and link to it; also find previous CCCCO validity assessments—Will Marmolejo to review his documents for this)

o English has both a computer and written portion; CCCCO validity assessment done in 2014 and the finding was that the writing portion was not valid for placement purposes and we have been directed to remove it (ask Bernadette Tchen English Dept for summary report—Will Marmolejo to review his documents for this); **Walden: So, the writing portion has been eliminated. How were the most recent cut scores validated and what guidelines established their use. Also, what is the documentation for this? [apparently we used East LA to do this]

o We accept placement exam results from other accredited colleges/universities. We check the validity of these exams by using assist.org to check equivalency, follow a template we have developed (link to it), and visiting their website
  - In fall 2015 the College’s Math and English placement test instruments will be validated by an external agency [provide the results once you have it; check that is has been initiated…follow up to Walden’s email]
  - Learning Skills uses a TABE® testing for placement; this is a standardized nationwide exam that is validated by Pearson (get more info from Maryanne DesVignes)
  - A Learning Disability assessment exam is used for academic accommodations. Two learning disability specialists have certification by the Chancellor’s Office (get more info from talk to Susan Matranga/Anderson).

Evaluations of placement processes used to ensure their consistency and effectiveness

- SSSP Plan mentions how placement tools are evaluated (find appropriate pages in the Plan—Will Marmolejo to do this).
- [Considering adding this to the SSSP Committee operating agreement]
- Describe here how these mechanisms allow DE students equitable access to our courses/programs

Analysis and Evaluation:

Elaborate on the above and provide examples of compliance. Describe the outcomes from previous validations and the upcoming 2015 Math and English placement test instrument external validation.

The College accepts placement results from regionally accredited colleges within one year of the student having taken the test. Counseling Office approves these. [can this method be used for our DE students as well? Will Marmolejo to look into this]
A majority of students (77%) are satisfied with Assessment and Placement Services (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #19b).

**Distance education.**

*Add something here on how placements are done for DE students. (Will Marmolejo?)*

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** 2.3.2 Identify additional alternative placement models for student assessment. *evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.*

[Willer to write this]

**Standard II.C.8.**

*The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- The District has policies for keeping student records, providing transcripts, and securing those records ([Board Rule, Chapter VIII, Article IV](#))
- Students are provided information on how to request transcripts in the catalog ([Catalog, p.215](#)) and online ([Online Grades and Transcripts](#)).

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The District has policies that each student must have “a cumulative record of enrollment, scholarship, and educational progress” (Board Rule, Chapter VIII, Article IV, 8400) and transcripts of those records can be accessed when enrolling in another school (Board Rule, Chapter VIII, Article IV, 8400). District policies are also in place to limit authorization of access to student records except under specific circumstances (Board Rule, Chapter VIII, Article IV, 8401.11) and for the protection of confidential student information (Board Rule, Chapter VIII, Article IV, 8404).

All physical documents in Admissions and Financial Aid are scanned through WebXtender and stored online on a protected server. After one year the physical documents are shredded. Files created at the Counseling Department on the electronic student education plan software, ActionPlanIt, are stored on a protected server. OSS and EOPS student records are kept in a locked room in a locked cabinet. The College uses the DEC to review transcripts, pre-requisite checks, and assessment scores, which are only accessible to appropriate full time classified staff and faculty.

The following offices process physical student records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Admissions and Records | All college applications are submitted online. Documents received are scanned and saved to a secure server. Files are kept in a cabinet in a secure area not accessible to students.

CalWORKS | Since 2013 CalWORKs has transferred all student files in a paperless electronic format. Staff are assigned a user ID and password. Files are backed up into a server each day. In addition, each staff is required to sign a confidentiality agreement which is required by Department of Public Social Services (DPSS). Viatron is the company that is being used for our electronic system and all security issues outside of our office has been vetted by LACC IT Department.

Career Center | Locked filing cabinet in the Director/Counselor’s office

EOP&S | Locked file cabinet

Financial Aid | Awaiting confirmation

Guardian Scholars | Active student files are located in the main office area, in a locked filing cabinet. Older/exited student files are secure in a closet.

International Students | Locked filing cabinets in an employee office under lock and key

OSS | Locked storeroom in locking file cabinets

Ralph Bunch Scholars | Locked filing cabinets in the Scholars office

Student Health | Stored electronically and password protected

Transfer Center | Locked filing cabinet in the Director/Counselor’s office

TRIO SSS | Locked filing cabinet within the director/counselor office

Veterans Office | Locked filing cabinet inside of the Veterans Resource Center (VRC)

The Admissions and Records Office tracks student requests for transcripts. Students submit a request (Transcript Request Form) to Admissions and Records either in hard copy or electronically (online portal to request transcripts). The request is entered into DEC to document the date of submission, and physical copies are either picked up or mailed as requested by the student. The majority of students (87%) say that they are satisfied with the services provided by Admissions and Records (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #19a).
Standard III
Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its mission and to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Accredited colleges in multi-college systems may be organized so that the responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning rests with the district/system. In such cases, the district/system is responsible for meeting the Standards, and an evaluation of its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution(s).

Throughout all of Standard III, make reference to the results of the spring 2015 and fall 2016 Admin Services survey results, as appropriate. The comparative data is located here.

Standard III.A. Human Resources

Standard III.A.1.
The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated and address the needs of the institution in serving its student population. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

For all positions
- Job classifications and descriptions are approved at the District level
- Minimum qualifications are established in the District Office of Human Resources, which align with California Education Code 87400 (Link to Cal Ed Code 87400, LACCD HR Guide R-101, 110, 120, District Equivalency Form, Verification of Experience Form)
- The LACCD Personnel Commission supports the College by advertising classified positions, ensuring candidates meet minimum qualifications, and assigning salaries (link to their website)
- The College has a clearly defined process for hiring probationary faculty and classified staff (Integrated Planning Handbook; HPC Policy; Classified Staff Policy)
- The District has a clearly defined process for hiring tenure track faculty (HR-120).
- The District has a clearly defined process for hiring non-classroom instructors (HR-121)
- The District has a process to review equivalencies of degrees from non-United States institutions. The potential hire is expected to hire a District approved third party vendor to translate their transcript. The translated transcript is then reviewed using the established approval process.

For probationary faculty
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Requests for probationary faculty occur through the program review to resource request process, and are prioritized by the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) and sent to the College President as a formal recommendation from the Academic Senate (link to HPC policy). The Probationary Faculty Prioritization Policy ensures that probationary faculty prioritization is based on College priorities. The process includes an analysis of data including enrollments, FTES/FTEF ratio, program completion rates, and staffing needs based on size of the department. Outcomes are documented through minutes and the final hiring prioritization list, which are posted online (link).

Faculty are involved in all steps of the faculty hiring process. The HPC is comprised of six faculty members out of nine voting members (HPC Operating Agreement). Faculty comprise the overwhelming majority of voting members on hiring committees (link to AFT contract page describing this).

Departmental hiring committees engage in dialogue to create job descriptions using state-approved minimum qualifications, which are vetted by the Dean and submitted to the District Human Resources for approval and posting. These committees assure that the qualifications for the position are closely matched to programmatic needs.

District Human Resources advertises probationary faculty positions (link to CC Registry)

The AFT Contract specifies the membership of hiring committees, with the department chair involved at all levels of the process. A compliance officer attends all faculty interviews.

Departmental hiring committees review applications using PeopleAdmin, rank candidates, develop appropriate interview questions, and submit candidates to the College President for final interviews, which ensures the hire is based on appropriate education, training, and experience. Title 5 requires that minimum qualifications and job descriptions for faculty includes sensitivity to diversity.

Qualifications of probationary faculty are verified as follows:
  - The qualifications of applicants are verified informally by the hiring committee
  - The qualifications of newly hired faculty are verified by District Human Resources (link to District process—find it)

Faculty remain probationary for the first four years, and have to undergo annual evaluation as part of the tenure review process

For adjunct faculty
  - Adjunct faculty are hired using state-approved minimum qualifications
  - The qualifications of adjunct faculty are included on transcripts and resumes, which are evaluated by the Department Chair and area dean (Notification of Adjunct Faculty Selection Form)
  - Human Resources application, new employee packet, and transcripts are sent to the District
  - Adjunct faculty openings are advertised directly by the Department
  - The Department Chair and area dean verify qualifications of adjunct faculty by reviewing sealed official transcripts

For classified staff
  - Hiring of classified staff follows District processes. The District personnel commission establishes minimum qualifications and job descriptions. Any reclassification of positions
is subject to review by the College. In this way the District and College assure that the qualifications for the position are closely matched to programmatic needs. (*link to Personnel Commission job description/minimum quals*)

- Requests for staff occur through the program review to resource request process, and are prioritized and sent to the College President as a formal recommendation
- The Staff Prioritization Policy ensures that staff prioritization is based on campus need
- LACCD Personnel Commission advertises classified staff positions and verifies the qualifications of newly hired staff.

For academic administrators

- The hiring of certificated administrators is governed by District HR Guide 110 (*Human Resource Guide HR-110: Academic Administrator, Selection*)
- LACCD Human Resources advertises certificated administrator positions through the District website and CCC Registry
- The hiring of classified administrators (unrepresented) is governed by the Personnel Commission (*Personnel Commission*). Job descriptions are developed by the Personnel Commission and shared with the College.
- The LACCD Personnel Commission advertises classified administrator positions
- When a supervisory position is requested, the District follows a process to ensure that the position is appropriate for the classification (*Agreement Between the LACCD and the LACCD Administrators’ Unit*, p.66)
- Applicants are required to submit unofficial transcripts, allowing the hiring committee to verify qualifications. Prior to an offer being made, the applicant must submit official transcripts that are verified by District Human Resources.
- Qualifications of classified administrators are verified by the Personnel Commission to ensure minimum qualifications are met.

Other

- Distance education faculty members are hired in the same way as adjunct faculty and have to do CMS training
- District personnel commission establishes minimum qualifications and job descriptions for unclassified positions
- New department chairs receive support in the processes for hiring in the Department Chairs Caucus, Academic Senate (*link to hiring training materials from Spring 2015*) and has developed other supporting materials (*Department Chairs Handbook*)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Through its clearly defined hiring procedures, the College ensures that administrators, faculty and staff are qualified to provide and support its programs and services. Written policies and procedures ensure that hiring procedures are consistently applied. Hiring committees for probationary faculty, classified staff, and administrators include an equal employment opportunity officer and a union representative. College constituencies can utilize their union representatives to ensure procedure is followed.
Requests for probationary faculty occur through the program review and resource request process, which ensures that prioritization is based on campus need. Requests are prioritized by a hiring committee and sent to the College President as a formal recommendation. Probationary faculty must meet state-approved minimum qualifications. Job descriptions are written by the departmental hiring committee and approved by the District personnel office. Members of faculty hiring teams undergo mandatory training, including a description of criteria, qualifications, procedures, and how to develop job descriptions (link to 2015 Mandatory Faculty Hiring Training). Jobs are advertised at the District website and at external job postings as selected by the departmental committee. The President does final interviews and checks references. The College and District’s human resources office verifies the qualifications of the probationary faculty, and District Human Resources reviews degrees and professional experience to determine salary level. If the faculty member has a degree from a non-U.S. institution, the faculty member is expected to get the transcript translated through a College-approved vendor, at which point the transcript is evaluated in the standard manner. Probationary faculty undergo a rigorous tenure review process, overseen by a committee of peers, that ensures the faculty member has the appropriate professional qualities, is current in the discipline, follows course outlines, participates in the SLO assessment cycle, and has appropriate knowledge, skill, and ability as a classroom instructor (AFT Contract, pp.189-192). A recent survey shows that 87% of students feel they receive excellent instruction in most of their courses (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #32f).

Full time and adjunct hires per fiscal year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requests for staff occur through the program review and resource request process, which ensures that prioritization is based on campus need. Requests are prioritized by a hiring committee and sent to the College President as a formal recommendation. Hiring of staff follows District Human Resources processes. Similarly, job classifications and descriptions for administrators are determined by District. After the College prioritizes its staffing needs and decides to hire a position, a request is submitted to the District Personnel Commission, which certifies the positions by reviewing organizational charts and duty statements to ensure the hire supports College needs.

Adjunct faculty positions are advertised locally through the department. Typically the department chair interviews the candidate, although other faculty members may be involved as well. Upon selection, the candidate is referred to LACC Human Resources to complete a hiring packet, which includes an Adjunct Selection Form that allows for verification of minimum qualifications (Notification of Adjunct Faculty Selection Form). The Adjunct Selection Form is
signed by the department chair, signed by the Dean after reviewing official transcripts, and finally signed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs. If candidate is requesting “equivalency,” a District discipline committee reviews the minimum qualifications and makes a formal recommendation to the District Academic Senate.

_Human Resources Plan. Write about it here once it is approved_

**Distance Education.** The College does not advertise specifically for personnel with experience in DE, although it sometimes adds DE as a desirable qualification. All probationary and adjunct faculty are approved through the standard processes and once approved they need to adhere to the policies for approving faculty teaching DE classes (link to DE Handbook). DE faculty members are required to complete Etudes training, classes in pedagogy, and develop a sample shell, at which point they are approved by the DE Committee to teach DE classes (link to DE Handbook). Although the College may include DE experience as a desired qualification for faculty hiring, the College does not specifically hire faculty to teach DE classes.

**Standard III.A.2.**

*Faculty qualifications include knowledge of the subject matter and requisite skills for the service to be performed. Factors of qualification include appropriate degrees, professional experience, discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty job descriptions include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- To ensure probationary faculty have appropriate knowledge of their subject matter:
  - Appropriate degrees: set in minimum qualifications and proven through a review of transcripts
  - Professional experience, discipline expertise, and potential to contribute to the mission: listed in resume and discussed during the interview
  - “Level of assignment” (???)
  - Scholarly activities: Traditionally considered as a desired qualification, given that we are not a research institution.
  - How the College defines and evaluates effective teaching in hiring processes
    - Interviews include traditionally teaching demonstrations; writing sample; and pedagogy portfolios including sample syllabi, assessments, and lesson plans
    - Evaluations include an assessment of classroom teaching
  - Curriculum review and learning outcomes assessments: Required as part of the job description (is this required? If so, who required it?). The AFT Contract lists as required duties that the faculty must keep current in one’s discipline, participate in the SLO assessment cycle. Additionally, the contract says it is a professional responsibility of faculty to participate in the collective work of the department in updates and revisions of course outlines, curriculum development,
advisory committees, program transfer and completion information (especially for counselors) and program review. (AFT LACCD Contract, p. 251).

- All of the above are considered through the probationary faculty tenure review process, basic evaluations, and comprehensive evaluations as specified in the AFT-LACCD contract (link to the process in the contract)

- To ensure adjunct faculty have appropriate knowledge of their subject matter

  - Department Chair interviews the prospective hire, reviews resumes, typically asking for pedagogy portfolios including sample syllabi, assessments, and lesson plans

  - Adjunct faculty undergo a basic evaluation before the end of their second semester of employment and at least once every six semesters of employment thereafter (link to the process in the contract, p. 69)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The probationary faculty hiring process ensures that faculty have the appropriate degrees and professional experience. Once hired, faculty are required to contribute to the vibrant life of the College and engage in activities that promote a quality education and student success (AFT Contract, p. 278). Department chairs and IDWG Deans (for adjunct faculty) and hiring committees and District HR (for full-time faculty) review faculty transcripts for minimum qualifications for degrees and professional experience. Faculty must provide evidence that they keep current in the discipline, fulfill professional development obligations, participate on committees, and engage in SLO assessments; these duties are assessed through tenure review and comprehensive and basic evaluations. As part of comprehensive and basic evaluations, teaching skills are assessed through required classroom observations and student evaluations (AFT Contract, Article 19.G.4; Article 42.C.6).

District HR has a list of minimum requirements that need to be included in all job descriptions, including curriculum review and development and SLO assessments. This is in the contract—find it [Check that this is true—ask Monica Martinez.] All faculty job descriptions are stored at the District website. A review of sample job descriptions indicates that these elements are included in the job description. [Do this at PeopleAdmin.]

**Distance Education.** DE faculty members are subject to the same evaluation process as traditional classroom instructors. The DE Committee has established a process for evaluating whether faculty members are qualified to teach DE classes. After the instructor completes Etudes training, classes in pedagogy, and develops a sample shell, the DE Committee uses a rubric to evaluate how well the faculty member has designed the online class (link to rubric). The College does not specifically hire faculty to teach DE classes.

**Standard III.A.3.**

Administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Evaluations of classified administrators (unrepresented academic administrators):
  - Defined in Board Rule (Board Rule 10105.12)
- Evaluations of certificated administrators:
  - Defined by contract (Agreement Between the LACCD and the LACCD Administrators’ Unit, pp.7-9)

Analysis and Evaluation:

**Evaluations of classified administrators.** Employees are evaluated as to their performance at least once every two years via an official performance evaluation (Performance Evaluation) that determines whether the employee is satisfactorily performing required duties. At LACC these include the Vice President of Administrative Services, Associate Vice President of Administrative Services, Director of Facilities, IT Manager, Bookstore Manager, and Teaching Learning Center coordinator.

**Evaluations of certificated administrators.** A job duty statement and annual goals, developed by the supervisor with input from the employee, are used as the basis for annual evaluations. An official form is used for the performance evaluation (Performance Evaluation) that determines whether the employee is satisfactorily performing required duties. At LA CC these include the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Student Services, and all Deans.

**Standard III.A.4.**
*Required degrees held by faculty, administrators, and other employees are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Qualifications of probationary faculty are verified as follows:
  - The qualifications of applicants are verified informally by the hiring committee
  - The qualifications of newly hired faculty are verified by District Human Resources (link to District process—find it)
- The qualifications of adjunct faculty are included on transcripts and resumes, which are evaluated by the Department Chair and IDWG Dean (link to Dept Chair sign-off form)
- Applicants for academic administrator positions are required to submit unofficial transcripts, allowing the hiring committee to verify qualifications. Prior to an offer being made, the applicant must submit official transcripts that are verified by District Human Resources.
- LACCD Personnel Commission advertises classified staff positions and verifies the qualifications of newly hired staff.
- The District has a process to review equivalencies of degrees from non-United States institutions. The potential hire is expected to hire a District approved third party vendor
to translate their transcript. The translated transcript is then reviewed using the established approval process.

- Evidence that hiring processes yield highly qualified employees:
  
  Manny Nuno to find this:
  
  - # of applicants for probationary faculty positions
  - # of new probationary hires who do not get tenure
  - # of new classified hires who do not pass probationary period
  - % of recent hires who were adjuncts

Analysis and Evaluation:

100% of faculty, administrators, and other employees possess degrees from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. LACC’s processes ensure that degrees are verified and that degrees from non-U.S. institutions have been granted equivalency from established agencies.

Our hiring processes yield highly qualified employees, as exemplified by the high percentage of new hires who pass their probationary period and get tenure. The hiring process and ensuing probationary evaluations are thorough and reveal whether new hires are highly qualified and possess the appropriate skills required for the position.

**Distance Education.** The DE Committee has established a process for evaluating whether faculty members are qualified to teach DE classes. After the instructor completes Etudes training, classes in pedagogy, and develops a sample shell, the DE Committee uses a rubric to evaluate how well the faculty member has designed the online class ([link to rubric]).

**Standard III.A.5.**

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- Performance evaluations for all College employees are covered either through collective bargaining agreements or by Board Rules. As part of all formal evaluations, criteria measure the effectiveness of personnel in performing their duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty, Basic and Comprehensive</strong></td>
<td>Article 19, Article 42, Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Faculty - Sections A, C, and D</td>
<td>Page 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Faculty - Section B</td>
<td>Page 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor - Section B</td>
<td>Page 183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty

- Criteria for evaluating faculty are stated in the AFT Faculty Contract (AFT Faculty Contract, pp. 180-220).
- Faculty duties, obligations, and activities are stated in the AFT Faculty Contract (AFT Faculty Contract, p. 278).
- Tenured faculty members are evaluated every three years, alternating a comprehensive and basic evaluation. The administration can call for an evaluation as well.
- Adjunct faculty are evaluated by the end of their second semester and at least once every three years after.
• Upon completion of an evaluation, the faculty member is given a copy of the evaluation including comments, recommendations, and improvement plans as appropriate; and faculty professional growth goals and plans (p. 190).

Staff (Clerical, Managers, Supervisors)

• Classified staff are evaluated every year by their immediate supervisor. The timeline and method for the evaluation is defined by the District Personnel Commission and the six unions that develop collective bargaining agreements ([District website with links to all contracts])
• The District has a clearly defined policy and process for performance evaluations for probationary and permanent classified employees ([PC Law and Rule 702: Performance evaluations for probationary and permanent classified employees])
• District Personnel Commission provides schedule for evaluating probationary staff and develops the components of the evaluation. Twice during probationary period and annually afterwards, the supervisor conducts the evaluation and submits it electronically to the Personnel Commission. If necessary, the supervisor will provide a work improvement plan. Outcomes of the evaluation may also include a consideration by the Personnel Commission of whether the duties of the employee are appropriate for the job classification.
• Unclassified staff, such as community services instructors and student workers, are “at will” temporary assignments and evaluated informally by their immediate supervisor, who can provide suggestions for improvement

Administrators

• The College president is evaluated annually or upon request by the LACCD Chancellor
• Vice Presidents complete a self evaluation annually and meet with the College president to review the assessment. A comprehensive evaluation occurs every three years and includes a formal evaluation committee. Negative evaluations must include specific recommendations for improvement and provisions for assisting the Vice President in implementing recommendations made. Evaluations are stored in the LACCD Human Resources office.
• Academic administrators, including Deans, are evaluated at the end of each academic year by their immediate supervisor. The evaluation results in the development of performance goals and objectives.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Employees agree that that policies and procedures for evaluating employees are strictly followed (2014: 52%; 2015: 57%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, Local 1521</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Technical</td>
<td>AFT College Staff Guild, Local 1521A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Los Angeles City and County Schools Employees Union, Local 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisors, Academic
California Teamsters Public, Professional and Medical Employees’ Union, Local 911

Supervisors, Classified
Supervisory Employees’ Union, S.E.I.U Local 721

Create a list of workshops on faculty evaluation (search the Senate site)
New Faculty Academy presentations on faculty evaluation processes (find them)

Employee evaluation processes are intended to lead to improvement of job performance. Each evaluation form measures the effectiveness of personnel in performing their duties. Upon completion of an evaluation, the employee is given a copy of the evaluation including comments, recommendations, and improvement plans as appropriate. If there is an improvement plan, the employee is given a timeline for completion of the plan. If there is no improvement, the College will utilize the progressive discipline process that may lead to dismissal and termination (Employer-Employee Relations Handbook). In this way the College connects the personnel evaluation to institutional effectiveness and improvement.

**Distance Education.** DE faculty members are evaluated in the same way as traditional classroom faculty, including identification of areas for improvement. Student evaluations of DE instructors include specific questions related to the DE modality (AFT-LACCD Contract, Appendix C, Section 2, p. 216).

**Standard III.A.6.**
The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**
Faculty

- Faculty evaluation includes an assessment of whether the faculty member participates in the student learning outcomes assessment cycle (AFT Faculty Contract, p. 189)
- The AFT’s clarification of the meaning of “participates in the SLO assessment cycle” states that “all instructors shall conduct SLO assessment in their assigned classes and use the results to make appropriate changes in instruction to improve student learning” (AFT Faculty Contract, p. 261)
- As part of the CSLO assessment process, faculty are asked to document if they implemented the action plan and if it resulted in improvements to student success.
- As part of program review, units use SLO assessment results to create plans intended to improve teaching and learning (Comprehensive and Annual Program Review Process)

Academic administrators
• Academic Deans write a job duty statement annually, including a reflection on their annual goals. Goals traditionally include SLO objectives to ensure compliance (link to academic administrator (President, Vice President) Teamster’s evaluation template).
• The Campus SLO coordinator reports to the VP of Academic Affairs. Findings of annual evaluations are shared with the coordinator at which point the assignment is extended.
• Academic Deans and the Vice President of Academic Affairs validate the results of comprehensive and annual program review, which includes a review of unit action plans coming from SLO assessments.

Analysis and Evaluation:

In-depth thinking faculty (individually and collectively) engaged in about how well students are learning in their courses and programs. Measures they have created to assess that learning? Different for DE? Discussions faculty have had to improve learning? Plans made? Changes faculty have made in teaching methodologies to improve learning.

- Christine Tinberg needs to write this
- See all leading questions in the Guide…they are all SLO assessment related

Faculty members must participate in the SLO assessment cycle. Full-time faculty members are required to write SLOs and establish assessment tools and rubrics. All faculty must include the officially approved course SLOs on course syllabi, conduct SLO assessments in their assigned classes and use the results to make appropriate changes in instruction to improve student learning. The faculty member is required to provide evidence of changes in instruction and improvement in student learning through data and the results of assessments and modifications. (AFT Faculty Contract, p. 261).

Academic administrators are asked in their annual evaluation to reflect on how well the College it meeting its ESMP, including student success and whether learning outcomes assessment is ongoing, systematic, and used to continuously improve student learning (ESMP Objectives 2.1.7, 2.1.8, 2.1.9).

**Distance education.** DE courses are assessed in the same way as traditional courses, including discussions about how well students are learning in courses, review of data indicating how well students met the criteria that measures their learning. Student learning outcomes measures are the same for DE and traditional classes.

**Standard III.A.7.**
*The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty, which includes full time faculty and may include part time and adjunct faculty, to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve institutional mission and purposes.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:
How the College determines appropriate levels of faculty to support each program and service

- The College assesses the quality of its educational programs and services through program review (Integrated Planning Handbook)
- The District meets its FON (California Code of Regulations Title 5, Section 51025)
- The College has a formal process for prioritizing faculty hiring requests, which is tied into program review and supports the ESMP (Faculty Hiring Prioritization Policy)
- Adjunct faculty are assigned classes based on seniority order (AFT Contract, pp. 50-56)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College hires an appropriate level of faculty to teach the classes needed for students to complete degrees and certificates. The Vice Chancellor of Human Resources in consultation with the College president to determine the faculty obligation number (FON), which guides the number of new probationary faculty members that will be hired each year. Classes that are not taught by full-time faculty members are taught by adjuncts.

Full-time faculty prioritization occurs in the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) through a clearly defined process (link to Faculty Hiring Prioritization Policy). Criteria for hiring faculty includes support of the ESMP, program needs and department goals identified through the program review process that includes SLO assessments, and enrollment and FTES/FTEF data (link to HPC Rating Form).

The College assesses the quality of its educational programs and services through program review (link to Integrated Planning Handbook). A recent survey shows that (2014: 42%; 2015: 42%) of faculty, staff, and administration agree (2014: 14.4% disagree) that human resource decisions are developed from program review results, annual unit planning, SLO assessments, and other data sources (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

Add a link to EMT planning documents (if they exist) indicated how we select # and type of courses. Talk to Thelma Day and Dan Walden.

Distance Education. **IS THIS IN THE DE PLAN?**

Add this to the DE Plan and then write about it here:

- By what means do we determine the # of DE courses we want to offer each year?
- How do we decide on organization of admin support staff in DE?
- How do we evaluate the effectiveness of our support services for DE?

**Standard III.A.8.**

An institution with part time and adjunct faculty has employment policies and practices which provide for their orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development. The institution provides opportunities for integration of part time and adjunct faculty into the life of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:
Orientation

- Adjunct faculty receive a packet from Human Resources that includes: salary schedule, information on benefits, faculty contract [Manny to email sample packet to you]
- The College uses its website to provide relevant information to all faculty, including adjuncts (Faculty Handbook)
- Adjuncts are invited to Faculty Symposium with adjunct specific breakouts (link to 2014 breakout on becoming full time)
- Each department has an adjunct faculty representative, who is available to assist adjuncts. A District Academic Senate (is this true?) adjunct representative is also available to support adjuncts

Oversight

- Ask Sharon Hendricks to write up something on who has oversight, based on the AFT Contract (she’s been emailed)

Evaluation

- AFT Contract covers evaluation of adjunct faculty [link to AFT Contract – Article 19, section E. Pg. 69)]

Professional Development

- Adjuncts are required to engage in professional development (AFT Contract, Appendix Q, A.6, p. 278; AFT Contract, Article 10, D2b, p.12)
- Adjuncts are eligible for professional growth funds [Guidelines on Conference and Tuition Reimbursement; link to Professional Growth Conference and Tuition Summary 2011-15]
- For a complete list of professional development activities, evaluation, and outcomes, including those for adjunct faculty, see Standard III.A.14.

Analysis and Evaluation:

LACC has a breadth of policies and practices that orient, evaluate, and provide both oversight and professional development to adjunct and part time faculty.

**Orientation.** The College uses its website to provide relevant information to adjuncts, especially through the Faculty Handbook. The District distributes copies of the AFT Contract to all new adjunct faculty members as part of the faculty hiring process (AFT Contract, Article 8.D). The Faculty Symposium is open to adjuncts, and as this is the largest gathering of faculty in one meeting, it provides opportunities for adjunct faculty to orient and integrate into the campus. Some breakout sessions are built to provide information specifically to adjunct faculty, and participation by adjuncts satisfies professional development obligations (AFT Contract, Article 10.D, p.12).

**Oversight.** The department chair is responsible for recruiting, selecting, evaluating, and assigning adjunct faculty, and monitoring their performance (AFT Contract, Article 17D.d; Articles 19 and 42).
Evaluation. Per contract, adjuncts are evaluated in the same manner as full-time faculty (AFT Contract, Articles 16.G.5; 17.F.6; 19.E and G; Appendix L). Adjunct faculty are required to incorporate approved SLOs in their teaching and they are evaluated on their participation in learning outcomes assessment (AFT Contract, Appendix L, p.261).

Professional development. Adjunct faculty, including temporary adjuncts and full-time faculty with additional assignments, are obliged to engage in professional development activities equal to half the sum of the standard hours of their fall and spring assignments. Adjuncts are eligible to receive conference reimbursement and tuition funds. Since 2011, the College has provided funding for 54 adjunct faculty to attend conferences (link to Professional Growth Conference and Tuition Summary 2011-15).

Adjuncts are required by contract to engage in professional development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Adjunct Completion of FLEX requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Add this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A drastic improvement in completion rates occurred in 2009-10 as a result of hiring a staff and organizational development coordinator with release time. The position has been consistently filled since then. The significant improvement in 2013-14 is a result of the College enforcing its policy of docking pay from those faculty members who do not complete the flex obligation.

Integration. The department chair is responsible for facilitating strong collegial relationships and teamwork among the department’s full and part-time faculty and staff; and facilitating adherence to applicable professional standards. Adjunct faculty are protected via the AFT contract in similar ways to full-time faculty, and adjunct faculty have equal access to union representation. Adjuncts have the opportunity to participate in shared governance. (list committees on which they can serve). Each department has an adjunct faculty representative, and this representative casts a single vote in any department chair elections (AFT Contract, Article 17, B.2.d, p.59). Most departments also have course captains and other full-time instructors who offer guidance and workshops to new adjunct faculty. Per contract, adjunct faculty have access to office space that is conducive to fulfilling their job duties (AFT Contract, Article 9.B.4, p.7).

The institution has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Sufficient Number
Hiring procedures for classified staff are determined by the District Personnel Commission (Commission website) reviews requests for classified positions to determine sufficiency (check the Classified Hiring Procedures documents to see if there is anything about “sufficiency”)

- Local determination of the sufficiency of support staff occurs as part of program review and the resource request process
- The College employs enough full-time maintenance and operations staff to meet Level 3 APPA guidelines (managed care level)

Appropriate Qualifications

- Minimum qualifications for staff positions are determined by the District Personnel Commission in consultation with collective bargaining units, and approved by the Board of Trustees

Analysis and Evaluation:

Through program review units assess whether they have a sufficient number of staff to support their operations. Units provide justification for hiring additional staff, and resource requests are prioritized through the standard budget process. If a position is considered a priority and the College has available funding, a request is sent to the District Personnel Commission, who reviews the request to determine sufficiency based on enrollment and other needs (link to PC document outlining this, if it exists).

Starting in 2015-16, the Classified Hiring Prioritization subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) assesses the classified position prioritization process, prioritizes requests using an approved rubric, and submits a list to the SPC, College Council, and President for approval (link to Classified Hiring Prioritization Policy). This process ensures that classified staff positions are filled in a manner that is consistent with the College’s mission and the goals established in the Educational and Strategic Master Plan and program review, as well as ensuring consistency with classified staff contracts (SIEU-Local 99, Supervisory Employees Local 721, AFT Classified Staff Guild 1521A, Building and Construction Trades). Prior to 2015-16, classified positions were requested through the traditional program review process, prioritized by College senior staff, and approved for hire by the College president.

Educational. Sufficiency of educational support staff occurs as part of program review and the resource request process.

Technology. The College strives to meet state standards for the number of IT staff positions needed to support its size and amount of technology (California CCCCO TCO Model, p.15). The number of students served per IT classified staff member is slightly higher than industry averages (October 23, 2013 District Technology Council presentation to Board of Trustees, p.15). A 2011 District staffing survey revealed a gap in satisfying minimum suggested levels (LACCD College Technology Staffing Survey, January 2011). Although the sufficiency of IT staff can in part be seen in the rate of completion of work orders and response times (link to the document Juan Mendoza sent), the staff also provides preventive maintenance to the servers in
the Data Center that provide email, physical security, websites, file shares, and positive attendance collection to the College.

**Physical.** As of summer 2015, the College employed 20 full-time maintenance and operations staff, which reduces the college’s ability to respond timely to maintenance requests and provide preventative maintenance activities to reduce the number of system failures. Based on LACC’s assignable square footage of 1,023,019 (2014-15), the College would meet Level 2 (comprehensive stewardship as defined by the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA)) by employing 23 full-time maintenance and operations staff. The College needs to employ 17 full-time maintenance and operations staff to meet Level 3 (managed care). Proof of the sufficiency of maintenance and operations staff is in the rate of completion of works orders and response times. (Provide some data analysis here—get Alex Nelson to run a report between 8/1/14-7/31/15 to match IT’s report.)

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** Although the College has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution, improved efficiency with enrollment management will allow the College to dedicate additional resources to support College operations. (See QFE, Action Project #1).

**Standard III.A.10.**
The institution maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that support the institution’s mission and purposes.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

**Sufficient Numbers**
- Funding for administrative positions is determined through the District funding allocation model
- Personnel Commission reviews requests for classified administration to determine sufficiency ([Check into this process? How is ‘sufficiency’ determined? Manny Nuno to look into this.])
- Senior Staff determines need for academic administration ([look into this])

**Appropriate Preparation and Expertise**
- Minimum qualifications for classified administrator positions are determined by the District Personnel Commission in consultation with collective bargaining units, and approved by the Board of Trustees
- Minimum qualifications for academic administrator positions are determined by the District ([HR-R-100]) and follows California Community College Board of Governors policy ([Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges])
• Organization of administrators is determined by the College president in consultation with senior staff, and is based on College needs to support the mission and availability of funding
• The process for modifying the organizational hierarchy is defined by the District (HR-H-100)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Administration consists of academic and classified managers and supervisors. Funding for administrative positions is determined through the District funding allocation model. In 2014-15, for example, the District funded the positions of the President, Administrative Services VP, Academic Affairs VP, Student Services VP, Director of College Facilities, and Institutional Research Dean. The number of Deans is determined by FTES; in 2014-15, for example, LACC was considered a medium size college and was allocated funding for eight Dean positions.

Manny Nuno to run a report on the # of administration positions we have and compare to the District funding model above.

2013 levels: ?
2014 levels: ?
2015 levels: 2 VPs, 7 Deans, 5 Associate Deans

Standard III.A.11.
The institution establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are fair and equitably and consistently administered.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Written personnel policies and procedures
• All personnel policies and procedures are published online:
  o Classified managers, supervisors, crafts, operations, and clerical staff;
    Unclassified (professional experts, recreational):
    http://laccd.edu/Departments/PersonnelCommission/ProcessInfo/Pages/default.aspx
  o Academic Administrator, Full-time and adjunct faculty, Unclassified (student workers):
    http://laccd.edu/Departments/HumanResources/HRPublications-2/Pages/default.aspx
• All collective bargaining agreements are published online:
  http://laccd.edu/Departments/HumanResources/Pages/Union-Contracts.aspx
• Personnel Commission process flowcharts (link to them at the District site)
• The District provides detailed information on performance evaluations, progressive discipline for classified and faculty, and dismissal and termination (Employer-Employee Relations Handbook)
The development of personnel policies at the local level

- Human Resources Plan was approved through the participatory governance process and posted online (link)
- New Classified Hiring Prioritization Process was approved through the participatory governance process and posted online (link)
- Probationary Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process was approved through the participatory governance process and posted online (link)

Fairly, equitably, and consistently administered

- The Board of Trustees has a standing agenda item to review administrative disciplinary actions (link to “HRD1 Personnel Services Routine Actions” on a sample Board of Trustees agenda)
- The District’s Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion supports College personnel who have concerns regarding fair and equitable treatment, and has detailed processes to handle issues of discrimination (Discrimination).
- Describe how “Escalation” works re: personnel issues.

Analysis and Evaluation:

All personnel policies and procedures adhere to California Education Code, collective bargaining agreements, District Human Resources, and District Personnel Commission regulations. All new employees are required to complete paperwork prior to being processed (District new employee forms and information). Employees are required to read policies on Child Abuse Identification Notification & Reporting Act (CANRA) and Discrimination/Sexual Harassment. Also required is an acknowledgement of employment conditions for specially funded programs. The District website includes information on expectations that new hires must perform their duties according to applicable laws, rules, and regulations and by avoiding the appearance of impropriety. State employment laws and job postings are displayed outside the Counseling, Student Services, and Human Resources Office.

Personnel policies are fairly, equitably, and consistently administered. The Personnel Commission administers the merit system of the Los Angeles Community College District. The merit system is a system of principles that guide the personnel management programs of most public jurisdictions in the United States. District Human Resources policy ensures that persons employed in academic positions meet the minimum qualifications prescribed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges as specified in California Education Code § 87400 Employment for Academic Positions.

The majority of employees agree that policies and procedures for hiring employees are strictly followed and that policies and procedures for evaluating employees are strictly followed (2014: 55%; 2015: 56%). Additionally, employees agree (2014: 65%; 2015: 65%) that they are treated equitably. (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015). The Human Resources office comprehensive program review includes a unit planning objective to increase staff training. Staff members participate in regular workshops on HR policies and procedures at both the campus and District Personnel Commission. Another improvement plan was to improve the College website by providing links to existing regulations, policies, handbooks, guides, and manuals. The
improvement plan is in progress and has been partially completed by linking to the District Human Resources website.

**Classified and Non-classified.** Personnel Commission audits ensure we adhere to policies. Findings are discussed at PC meetings (*link to PC agendas/minutes*).

**Probationary Faculty.** Run report on the number of positions filled from the past few years of prioritization lists, showing that we are indeed hiring off the list. Probationary faculty are additionally informed of District and local policies and procedures as part of the New Faculty Academy (*link to website*).

Changes in District hiring processes and policies are discussed at monthly Single Point of Contact (SPOC) meetings. Formal notification of any change is provided to campus leadership, who notify appropriate personnel.

**Standard III.A.12.**
*Through its policies and practices, the institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Policies and practices promoting understanding of equity and diversity issues

- A District promotes equal opportunity through a Board Policy on Affirmative Action (*Chapter X, Article 13*)
- The District has an **Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**
  - The District sends all employees periodic newsletters that cover topics related to equity and diversity issues (*In Compliance*)
  - The District Personnel Commission sends classified staff bulletins of best practices concerning the workplace (*Employee Bulletins*)
  - The District Personnel Commission provides information on classified staff career advancement (*Upward Mobility Plan and Career Ladder Guide*)
  - The District Personnel Commission sends supervisors bulletins of best practices concerning the workplace (*Supervisory Bulletins*)
  - All hiring committees are required to have an Equal Employment Opportunity officer. The District provides EEO trainings to staff who participate on hiring committees.
  - The District offers an Employee Assistance Program (EAP), providing assistance to employees including counseling (*link to website*)
- The College has participated in Project Match, which promotes quality instruction and diversity in community college teaching (find out how many for the past few years)
- **Student Equity Plan** (*ask Jeffrey Nishimura to provide a summary—including prof dev activities*)
- The College requires probationary faculty to participate in the New Faculty Academy, which includes information on ______ (Christine Park)
How the institution determine the kind of support its personnel needs
- Faculty symposium survey results 2015 (link)
- Annual review of staff and organizational development activities within the Staff and Organizational Committee (???)
- College trainings? District trainings? Continuing Education opportunities?
- Encouraging people to get differentials including the bilingual differential (*year-end summary data on how many people do this should be at Personnel Commission website*)

How the College tracks its employment equity record
- The District Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion provides employee diversity data (*LACCD Workforce Analysis 2014*)

How the College uses information on employment equity
- *how do we USE this information? Someone needs to do an analysis of the Workforce Analysis 2014 (see above)—Randy Anderson?*

How the College ensures that personnel and students are treated fairly
- Student evaluation form [link to the statement dealing with equity]
- Campus Climate survey results 2014 and 2015 (link)
- Faculty evaluation? (is there something here?)
- District student survey? (is there something here?)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College reviews disaggregated data on all employees by job type. The College has a diverse workforce. The District Personnel Commission provides counseling to classified personnel as needed.

*Talk to Gene Little about this—maybe he can give info on A.11 as well*

Talk to C Tinberg about how HR has been assessing their learning outcomes. Can she generate a report?

*How do we track, analyze, and use our employment equity record?*

A majority of employees (2014: 58%; 2015: 59%) agree that human resources policies and practices at LACC clearly demonstrate commitment to equity and diversity (LACC Campus Climate Survey 2014, 2015).

**Action Plans.**
- By spring 2016 add a link to the Faculty/Staff page to “Human Resources”
• For the 2016 program review, determine a mechanism to track and analyze the College’s employment equity record

**Standard III.A.13.**
The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including consequences for violation.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Written code of ethics for all personnel

- A District policy outlines the code of ethics including academic rights and responsibilities ([Board Rule, Article II, 1204](#))
- The Academic Senate has an Academic Senate Statement on Professional Ethics
- The District has a policy on prohibited discrimination and harassment (Board Rule, Article XV)
- Classified Employee Handbook (see p. 31)
- Unclassified Handbook (see p. 9)

Fostering ethical behavior through an awareness of consequences for violation

- The District has a process for progressive discipline regarding consequences for behavioral or performance issues ([Employer-Employee Relations Handbook](#))
- A District Board policy outlines the procedures used to address issues of prohibited discrimination and harassment (Board Rule, Article XV)
- Progressive discipline is used in the District when an employee’s work performance or behavior on the job is below work performance standards ([Classified Employee Handbook](#), p. 32)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College follows District policies that define professional ethics and the consequences for violation.

- Use the above evidence and write about it here
- Once the Senate Ethics Committee writes it document and the Curriculum Handbook is done, include information about it here

[Part of faculty and classified evaluations is to determine the employee’s level of professionalism—is this relevant?]

**Distance education.** Is there anything in the DE Handbook or DE Plan that talk about anything like ethics for DE instructors?

**Action Plans**
- Update the Academic Senate Statement on Ethics
- Add a Code of Ethics page to the “Faculty/Staff” website main page, including a link to Board Rule 1204

**Standard III.A.14.**
*The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

***GO THROUGH THE STAFF DEV PLAN AND ADD ACTIVITIES ONLINE****
***ALSO GO THROUGH PAST CITY CHATTER DOCS TO SEE WHICH ACTIVITIES WE OFFERED***

- Go through past “City Chatter” documents and make a list of all the events we’ve held over the past few years (Colleen Stringfellow and Ronda Goudeau)
- The President supports mandatory training, including trainings in legal counsel, Blackboard technology, and sexual assault (talk to Naira Sarginian on how she tracks this—copy of report she sends to the District?)

*****

- Mandatory Flex completion for all faculty
- Faculty Symposium required for full-time faculty, open to adjunct faculty (pedagogy and methodology)
- New Faculty Academy for probationary faculty (*New Faculty Academy*) (pedagogy and methodology)
- Conferences for faculty, staff, and administration
- Faculty Learning Award for all faculty (pedagogy and methodology)
- Brown Bags
- Teaching Learning Center trainings and workshops for all personnel
- Mandatory trainings for personnel (*sexual assault, legal counsel, Blackboard, etc*)—*waiting to hear back from Naira S*
- Cultural events (Music, Theater, Dance, Cinema/TV)
- Persistence Inquiry Project (use of data)
- Days of Dialogue
- FTLACC

*****

- Student Services Annual SLO Kickoff (*Tinberg*)
- Leadership and College Processes
  - FTLACC participants and summary (*Daryl Kinney*)
The President encourages leadership by ensuring that the vice presidents participate in state conferences (get info from Prez Martinez)
Accreditation workshops and conferences

- **Pedagogy and Methodology**
  - The College provides funding for employees to attend conferences: 50 conferences were funded in 2013-2014; 57 conferences were funded in 2014-15 (see complete list of 2013-14 and 2014-15 conference attendance; also link to 2015-16 online database)
  - Faculty Learning Award encourages instructors to further explore/add to their field (Marlos has info?)
    - Presentations on teaching methodologies include David Sedghi’s use of cell phones
  - Supplemental instruction orientation and monthly meetings, funded through the Basic Skills initiative (Jeffrey Nishimura has minutes and will write a report with list of meetings and people who got trained; Thi Thi Ma now in charge)
  - **Distance Education**
    - Workshops (Nancy Cairns?)
    - Title 5 grant to support 22 faculty to develop Etudes shells (Felicia Duenas to write a few sentences on this)

- **Technology**
  - MOUS training differential (Atkinson)
  - Distance education Etudes training (Pamela Atkinson)
  - Sea Monkey workshops (find dates) on website design (Pamela Atkinson)
  - Adobe Illustrator training (Nate Lorentz)
  - SharePoint training (done in Emil Mubarakshin’s office)
  - eLumen for use in SLO assessments
  - SharePoint for use in program review
  - ECD for use in curriculum (ask April Pavlik if there is documentation of trainings)
  - Trainings on ESC, DEC, BW

- **Use of Data**
  - Persistence Inquiry Project, recommended through Achieving the Dream and carried through to Equity funding (Daryl Kinney and Andrew Walzer to get list of meetings and people who got trained)
  - Program review training, including how to use data
  - Days of Dialogue

- **Equity and Cultural Responsiveness**
  - Life Science training for at-risk youth (Jeffrey Nishimura to get info on this)
  - Book Program (Alex Maeck to write up a summary with # of participants)
  - Bilingual differential (who knows about this?)

College supported activities
• The College tracks its professional development programs on its Staff and Organizational Development website (Staff and Organizational Development website)

• Ongoing programs include:
  o New Faculty Academy, for probationary faculty (New Faculty Academy)
  o Add based on list Jen is putting together on S&OD website

Planning and identifying needs
• The College has an ongoing Staff and Organizational Development Plan, which includes action plans in support of the ESMP and supports other College plans including SSSP, Student Equity Plan, Achieving the Dream, and Basic Skills Plan (link)
• Action plans in the Staff and Organizational Development Plan are assessed annually (ESMP Progress Report Committee Updates)
• Staff and Organizational Development outcomes are assessed annually as part of annual assessments (link to several past assessments)
• The College submits its plans for annual professional development activities to the CCCCO (link to Flexible Calendars from past few years)
• The College tracks faculty completion of required professional development activities (link to Flex Report Templates for 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14)
• The College uses satisfaction survey results to plan activities based on need (link to survey template; link to 2014 and 2015 Flex Day survey results; link to Days of Dialogue survey results)

Documentation of processes and procedures
• Committee responsibilities
  o Staff and Organizational Development Operating Agreement (link)
  o Professional Development standing committee (Academic Senate Bylaws)
• Handbooks
  o Faculty Handbook (link)
  o Department Chairs Handbook (link)
  o Professional Development Handbook (link to draft)
  o Staff Development Coordinator Job Description (link)

Evaluation
• The College compiles faculty completion of required professional development activities (link to Flex Summaries for 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14)
• The College uses satisfaction survey results to plan activities based on need (link to survey template; link to Flex Day survey results; link to Days of Dialogue survey results)
• The Professional Development Committee assesses its performance (link to annual assessments)
• The Staff and Organizational Development Committee assesses its performance (link to annual assessments)
• Any employee receiving funding to attend conferences needs to submit a Conference Attendance Reporting Form (link to template)
- Online system for tracking professional growth funding used for professional development ([Online System](#))
- Assessed through Flex Reporting Forms (Adjunct Flex Reporting Form; Full-time Faculty Flex Reporting Form)
- Assessed through Conference Attendance Reporting Forms
- Staff and Organizational Development Activity Satisfaction Survey
- Guidelines on Conference and Tuition Reimbursement Processional Growth Committee

Impact
- Action plans in the Staff and Organizational Development Plan are assessed annually ([ESMP Progress Report Committee Updates](#))
- Staff and Organizational Development outcomes are assessed annually as part of annual assessments ([link to several past assessments](#))
- Annual reporting on other College plans that have a professional development component including SSSP, Student Equity Plan, Achieving the Dream, and Basic Skills Plan

Analysis and Evaluation:

**Opportunities for Personnel**

All personnel have opportunities for professional development. The College submits annual reports summarizing the activities it provides for faculty that are related to staff, student, and instructional improvement ([link to California Community Colleges Flexible Calendar Program Activities 2014-15; 2015-16](#)). Full-time faculty are required to complete 33.5 hours of professional development; adjunct faculty also have a professional development obligation ([AFT Contract, Article 10.D1-4](#)). New faculty are required to participate in the New Faculty Academy.

Full-time and adjunct faculty qualify for conference and tuition funding. Since 2011 the College has provided funding for 138 full-time and 54 adjunct faculty members to attend conferences ([link to Professional Growth Conference and Tuition Summary 2011-15](#)). Tracking of funding is done using an online system ([Professional Growth Tracking](#)). Staff are encouraged to participate in on-campus activities. Administrators attend conferences ([link to the document Ronda sent](#)).

Professional development is supported on campus in the Teaching Learning Center (TLC), which provides faculty and staff with training and technical assistance to support instruction, with an emphasis on using technology to increase teaching effectiveness and student learning ([Teaching Learning Center](#)). The TLC provides assistance and training in the use of computer hardware and peripheral devices, with an emphasis on supporting classroom instruction and software training. The TLC also supports the College’s distance education offerings including providing assistance for faculty completing the required CMS training and online pedagogy course.

**Identification of Needs**
The Staff and Organizational Development Committee, a standing subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), oversees the campus professional development program (Title 5, Section 55720), which offers faculty and staff opportunities to participate in activities that enhance institutional effectiveness practices and promote engagement by all employee groups. The Committee creates and oversees the Staff and Organizational Development Plan. The Staff and Organizational Development Plan 2015-2020 provides supporting action plans to help the College meet the goals of the ESMP (link to Staff and Organizational Development Plan).

The Faculty Professional Development Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, is responsible for making recommendations to the Academic Senate on policies for faculty professional development activities, and for the planning of professional development activities, including the fall opening Faculty Symposium Day.

The College has a Professional Growth Committee that administers the professional conference and tuition reimbursement funds and tracks outcomes of those professional development activities (link to operating agreement).

Faculty indicate which activities they want the College to provide through the faculty symposium survey (link to survey) and as part of the online Flex activity survey (link). The College recently developed a classified staff survey as well (link). As part of the 2012 CPR, units were asked to review professional development completion measures and design improvement plans as necessary (link to 2012 CPR, Discipline Progress Towards College Strategic Goals, Goal C).

**Evaluation and Impact**

Professional development is systematically evaluated using annual campus climate survey results, annual faculty completion of required professional development activities (link to Annual Flex Summary Reports), conference attendance forms (link), and annual Faculty Symposium surveys (link). Future plans are based on an analysis of outcomes from previous plans (Staff Development Plan 2014-2020).

Full-time and adjunct faculty basic and comprehensive evaluations include whether the faculty member fulfills professional development responsibilities (AFT Contract, p. 189). Faculty members are required to submit Flex Reporting Form to ensure compliance with contractual obligations (link to form). Completion of mandatory flex requirements has increased dramatically since 2008-09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% FT Completion</th>
<th>% Adjunct Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The drastic improvement in Flex completion in 2009-10 was a result of hiring a staff and organizational development coordinator with release time. The position has been consistently filled since then. The significant improvement in 2013-14 is a result of the College enforcing its policy of docking pay from those faculty members who do not complete the flex obligation.

Faculty and staff have the opportunity to attend conferences, supported in part by professional development funds:

- # of people who went on conferences paid by us; # FT/adj; # of different events—see charts Genevieve sent you
- # of people who got tuition reimbursement; # FT/adj; # of activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Number of Conferences</th>
<th>Number of Tuition Reimbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Fill in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional development for administrators occurs primarily through conference attendance, with outcomes documented in post-conference attendance forms (link).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Administrators</th>
<th>Number of Conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of Professional Development and S&OD committee outcomes is done through annual assessments (link to assessments from previous years).

The primary professional development activity for faculty is the Faculty Symposium (link to agendas for previous 3 years). All full-time faculty are required to attend and adjunct faculty are encouraged to attend. Faculty complete a post-event survey and the results are used by the Professional Development Committee to improve offerings (Faculty Symposium 2015 Survey Results).
- NFA post survey results
A significant program offered by the College is the Book Program. Each year the College chooses a theme or book, and develops a series of supporting events. In the past few years the College has offered between 4-8 events with between 600-1,500 participants (link to LACC Book Program Report 2010-Present). These events are designed to foster equity and cultural responsiveness, and provide a unique opportunity for faculty, staff, administrators, and students to engage in dialogue.

The College sponsors events and supports engagement in conferences to increase leadership capacity. Faculty gain leadership skills in the New Faculty Academy, Academic Senate retreats, ASCCC Plenary Sessions, FTLACC, ACCJC accreditation workshops and trainings, and ASCCC institutes, among others. Staff engage in the Classified Staff Symposium, SSSP, EOPS, CalWORKS, and Student Equity trainings, and participate in Region 7 trainings, among others. Administrators gain leadership skills through numerous workshops and conferences (link to Conferences Attended by Administration 2012-2015).

A majority of faculty, staff, and administration agree that the College has provided sufficient support and training in SLOs and assessment (2014: 63%; 2015: 67%); that LACC provides them with adequate opportunities for continued professional development (2014: 55%; 2015: 57%) and that the members of their department or program stay current in their fields of expertise (2014: 62%; 2015: 71%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015).

Response to 2009 ACCJC Recommendation
In response to a recommendation regarding professional development in the 2009 ACCJC Evaluation Report (link), the College developed a planning agenda and four future plans, as well as creating objectives and action items to support the 2008-2013 Strategic Master Plan. The ACCJC reported in its April 2010 follow-up evaluation that “the team found evidence of immediate and extensive response to [the Staff Development] recommendation and believes that the college has fully met the expectations therein” (link to letter). The March 15, 2012 LACC Midterm Report submitted to the ACCJC indicated that the College successfully completed the four “Future Plans” that were outlined in the initial campus follow-up report of 2010. The 2012 Midterm Report outlined the College’s plans for continued professional development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 Midterm Report Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Status as of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing to use data from flex reporting forms, faculty and staff surveys, the Staff and Organizational Development Plan and other campus plans to create workshops and activities that support the institution’s mission and provide faculty and staff appropriate preparation and experience.</td>
<td>Completed. Data includes the annual campus climate survey, surveys on flex activity satisfaction, conference attendance summaries, flex reporting summaries, and data included on the professional development components in the Basic Skills and Student Equity Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing to annually assess and update the Staff and Organizational Development Plan, Operating Agreement, and Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Completed on an annual basis; ongoing. The Staff and Organizational Development Plan is updated as part of the ESMP cycle, the S&amp;OD operating agreements are revised and approved through the governance process annually, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuing to use the results of the Staff and Organizational Development program review module to inform future professional development plans

Continuing to maintain and enhance the Staff and Organizational Development website

Planning workshops and training to facilitate the adoption of new educational technologies throughout the curriculum, in line with the recently adopted Board goal promoting the adoption of Web 2.0 interactive technologies

**Distance education.** The College requires that all DE faculty are certified on the CMS and have completed distance learning pedagogy training (*DE Handbook, p.x*). Faculty may use distance learning training hours as part of their professional development obligation (Contract, Article 40.B.5, p.149). What specific DE activities do we offer (Carlos Guerrero)?

**Action Plans**
- For the spring 2016 cycle, change the Flex Reporting Form to include description of how the activities led to improved teaching and learning
- By spring 2016, develop and vet through the governance structure a Professional Development Handbook that defines appropriate activities that qualify for Flex

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** In order to institutionalize long-term professional development activities that are currently being supported through external funding sources such as the Student Equity Plan, the College needs to provide a stable funding source (See QFE, Action Project #1).

2.2.2 Provide professional development for faculty engaging in FYE/City Pathways; *Profess dev [Wanner to write this]*

**Standard III.A.15.**

*The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

**Provisions for keeping personnel records secure and confidential**
- All personnel records (evaluations, hiring packet, formal discipline actions, U-notices, employee responses to formal actions or evaluations) are stored at the District
• Employment history is maintained electronically, accessible only by employees in the Personnel and Payroll offices.
• Personnel records in the form of applications and forms submitted by the employee exist as hard copies and are initially stored in a personnel file at the College Human Resources office. After local review, they are transferred to District Human Resources, which maintains the files.

How employees can access their records
• Per District Board Rule, the employment records of all employees shall be established and maintained by the Division of Human Resources (Board Rules, Chapter X, Article 1, 10105)
• Employees can formally request a letter verifying employment with the District (Employment Verification Request)
• Employees can request from District Human Resources to see their personnel records; follows Labor Law and Title 5—find these references; also mentioned in contracts [Manny Nuno to send you the official form]

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College does not permanently keep personnel records. All such records are stored at the District office. Records stored on campus are kept in a locked cabinet in the Personnel Office. [need to say how the District stores these records—ask Monica Martinez at the District about this]

Standard III.B. Physical Resources

Standard III.B.1.
The institution assures safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. They are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

As of the 2014-15 academic year, the College facility encompasses 1,023,019 gross square feet, of which 559,654 is assignable square footage used for lecture, lab, and office space. Recent facilities added to the campus since 2008, include the college’s Student Union, the Science and Technology Building, and the Kinesiology North Building. Additionally, the modernization of Clausen Hall was completed this past fall (2015), and a new Student Services Building, along with the modernization of Holmes Hall, is scheduled for completion in spring 2016. All construction and modernization on the campus adheres to the Division of the State Architect
standards (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations parts 1-12) and all American Disability Act (ADA) requirements.

The College offers classes on campus, off campus, and online. In fall 2014, the college offered 35 sections at 22 high schools, 20 sections at 23 high schools in spring 2015, and 46 sections at 26 high schools in fall 2015. The college also offers non-credit success academies at 63 off-site locations. The college also offers 5-10% of its semester offerings in an online format. The college provides faculty members sufficient instructional and technical support for the delivery of instruction, whether it is face-to-face or online. This support includes the college providing office space, a work desk and storage, training for online course instruction, classroom keys, a computer, internet access, and access to copying facilities.

College groups, such as the Curriculum Committee, Distance Education Committee, and the Enrollment Management Team, meet to discuss and plan the content and scheduling of course offerings, including the proposed method of instructional delivery, and the Technology Steering Committee, helps the Director of Informational Technology by meeting to discuss and plan the equipment and technology that is needed for instructional and non-instructional program and service needs. Staff is also encouraged to take advantage of professional development opportunities to get trained on new and best practices, in order to assist the college with improving the quality of its technology support and program offerings.

The Director of College Facilities is responsible for the management and maintenance of the college facilities. In 2014-15, the Facilities Department employed a staff of approximately 59 people, which included the Director of College Facilities, an Administrative Aide, a Senior Office Assistant, a General Foreman, an Operations Manager, 20 Building and Trades personnel, and 34 Custodial staff. While the staff is responsible for the recurring and scheduled maintenance on all college buildings, they do not provide maintenance to any of our offsite locations. Offsite locations are maintained by staff employed by the Los Angeles Unified School District, or, the City of Los Angeles Parks and Recreation Department.

Additionally, the college uses a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) that allows users to submit work order requests for service, and the system provides reminders and tracks completion of preventative and deferred maintenance. The college is compliant with ADA regulations, pass regular ADA inspections, and all buildings meet Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) guidelines. The college also posts all required health and safety notifications.

For campus security, the college contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, who provide daily video monitoring, escort services, and patrolling of the campus grounds and parking lots. The college unit consists of a Team Leader, two Deputy Sheriff’s, and ten Sheriff Security Officers. This team is complemented by student Cadets, who assist with parking enforcement and escort services.

Members of the Sheriff’s Department also assist the college by participating, and serving as leads when needed, for the following safety teams:
Emergency Response Team: oversees the emergency operation plan, arranges drills
Threat Assessment Team: provides assessment and services for high risk students
Behavioral Intervention Team: resources for low risk students
Sexual Violence Response Team: resources for victims

The College also provides routine safety training which includes earthquake, fire, and active shooter drills. College buildings each have a building captain and floor warden to assist with evacuation in the event of an emergency. The college also uses the Blackboard Connect system to provide mass email/text/phone notifications to faculty, staff, and students in the event of an emergency, and the college has a Blue Light talk-a-phone system in place in our buildings and at locations outside buildings. Panic buttons are also installed in select campus offices, which send a direct alert to the Sheriff’s Office. There are four Automated External Defibrillator (AED) units located strategically on campus, and AED and Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR) training classes are available for faculty and staff.

All facilities are assessed annually for safety and security, and locations that are not acceptable for use, are not leased for the offering of any college classes or programs. The Facilities and Maintenance unit falls under the supervision of the Vice President of Administrative Services, who provides guidance and direction with facilities planning, the prioritizing of scheduled maintenance projects, budget, and staffing needs.

**Standard III.B.2.**
*The institution plans, acquires or builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources, including facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services and achieve its mission.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College plans, builds, upgrades, or replaces facilities consistent with the needs specified in its educational and facilities master plans, and in a manner which ensures the effective utilization of its limited space. The Educational Master Plan (EMP) serves as the vision of the Facilities Master Plan (FMP), which serves as the blueprint for college construction and improvements when funding is available. The current FMP, which covered the period of 2002-2012, is scheduled for review and update in spring 2016. Given the administrative turnover on the campus, this plan was not reviewed and updated prior to 2012. However, the Vice President of Administrative Services has instructed the Director of College Facilities to begin the process for reviewing, updating, and replacing the outdated document, in order to bring our FMP current with the present and projected needs of the college.
Current construction projects which have been approved, and which are still awaiting construction pursuant to the existing plan are the following:

- Central Plant Upgrade (2015)
- DaVinci Hall Modernization (2015)
- Cesar Chavez Modernization (2017)
- South Gymnasium Modernization (2017)

These projects will complete funding provided in the most recent District bond (Measure J). The new college FMP will provide the guidance for future construction and modernization on the campus.

As part of the College planning process, the college Facilities Planning Committee provides review of the FMP and provides recommendations and input to the document. This group also reviews the status of ongoing construction projects, and provides feedback to the construction project manager during monthly meetings which are held to discuss current projects. The committee also is charged with making recommendations to the College Council and college President, regarding any issues or concerns regarding the implementation of the FMP, and as part of its annual assessment, the committee documents actions it has taken to support the FMP.

All College construction is aligned with the District’s Bond Master Plan (funded through Measures A, AA, and J) which has been used to guide new construction and modernization projects since 2001. Unfortunately, a District Bond moratorium in 2011, along with a drop in enrollment, resulted in the College being at 140% of its capacity load in lecture space. Given this, an adjustment in the allocation of bond funding for construction occurred in 2011 resulting the cancellation of two construction projects and a reduction in the scope of several other projects.

Additionally, information provided from department and unit program reviews, demographic data from the surrounding community, information on anticipated student growth and demand, the analysis of facility capacity load ratios, and an annual facilities, maintenance, and operations survey, help provide the college with the data needed to plan for future facility and equipment needs for instructional, as well as non-instructional, programs and services offered on campus, off campus, or online. This information is incorporated into the college goals and objectives that are included in the EMP and the FMP.

Program review data is also used to help guide the annual one-time resource allocation process for instructional equipment. Equipment replacement, and in some cases, maintenance needs, which are reflected in program review updates are forwarded from each of the college operating areas (Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services) to the college Budget Committee; one of the college’s participatory governance groups, who review requests and submit a prioritized list of needs to the college President based on college goals and objectives. Items on this list are funded based on the amount of state block grant funding received by the college. We note that for the past two fiscal years, the college has provided funding to meet all of its instructional equipment requests.
**Standard III.B.3.**

To assure 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.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

To ensure the effectiveness of our physical resources, the College uses data from the Facilities Utilization and Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) to review our space inventory and assess our capacity/load ratios. This process assists us with identifying where more space is needed, or, where we need to reduce space. Annual FUSION reports are used to guide deferred maintenance projects and determine the efficiency of room use on campus. This information is critical to the update of the college Five Year Capital Outlay Plan and will be instrumental in the development of a new FMP.

Facilities maintenance and custodial services planning also occurs through the integrated planning process. Unit planning objectives are aligned with the college EMP, and include action plans to accomplish the objective. Unit plans have associated measures for each objective, and they are assessed annually. This process allows the unit to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of all of our physical resources, and allows the unit to identify facilities, equipment, and maintenance needs for the college.

The College also uses the results from the LACCD Student Climate Survey, and the annual Administrative Services survey; which is distributed to faculty, staff, and students, to review the use of our physical resources, assess the condition of the facilities and general upkeep, and to address any perceived service issues with facilities and maintenance. This data is shared with Facilities and Maintenance managers, and discussions with the Vice President of Administrative Services are held to address concerns, set annual goals for improvement, and make plans for needed maintenance and equipment. This data is also used along with program review data, to help with annual resource and staffing requests for the unit.

Preventative maintenance issues, which include lighting, plumbing, HVAC, and general cleanliness, is tracked through the CMMS work order system. This system also provides the unit with reminders on the life expectancy of equipment and needs for replacement. This system also helps the unit allocate staff hours for projects, prioritize requests; with highest priority given to requests that pose health and safety risks to the college, and the system tracks the status of each work order request. CMMS reports are reviewed by the Operations Manager and Director of Facilities weekly.

**Standard III.B.4.**
Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

As part of the College FMP, as well as the Bond Master Plan, new buildings and modernizations are programmed based on the needs of the college and the programs occupying the building. These needs are developed through the assessment and review of community workforce and transfer needs for students, the emergence of new programs, or the reduction of outdated programs, and enrollment forecasts reflected in the college EMP. Using this data, derived in prat from program reviews, the College develops plans for future buildings and construction to meet the projected needs.

These needs are discussed with several campus groups, which include the Strategic Planning Committee, the Facilities Committee, and the College Council. Each of these participatory governance groups have a role to play in the review and recommendation of information that is included in either the EMP, or the subsequent FMP, which is derived from the former document. These planning groups collectively work together to review College processes and recommendations, and they assist the college in moving forward with its goals and objectives to make improvements to the college’s physical resources, and its delivery of instructional and non-instruction programs and services.

Each of these groups also performs an annual assessment regarding its performance. The results of the assessment are used to determine the effectiveness of the committee in helping the college advance its goals. It also serves as a measure to provide for improvements, if needed.

For each proposed project, total projected costs include the total costs of construction, which could include swing space, the demolition of existing structures, the acquisition of land or property, drawing and design fees, DSA costs, actual construction, and fixed furniture and equipment to complete the building. In determining ongoing costs related to staffing, utilities, and equipment, the college assesses the new square footage proposed in order to determine if any additional staffing would be necessary to maintain and repair the structure. If additional staffing is needed, a request for personnel is submitted for review and approval, subject to available funding. Any increased differential for utility costs is also analyzed in order for the cost increase to be included in projected expenses during the year the building is brought online. Lastly, to replace outdated equipment, the college goes through a review of outdated equipment, and includes these items for replacement during the program review process. Replacements are made subject to available funding.

On a routine basis however, and when funding is available, the college purchases extended warranties on equipment. We also set up service contracts for specialized equipment (including
chillers, boilers, lighting controls, fire alarm, elevators, state/city permits, environmental fees, and sanitation) which is maintained by Facilities in order to maintain the equipment through its usable service life, which could range from five to forty years depending on the type of equipment.

Self-Evaluation

The College provides safe and sufficient physical resources to support and assure the quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or delivery method. Using the EMP and FMP, the college has built and modernized its facilities to provide state of the art technology and services to our students. However, in reviewing the current FMP, the college realizes that in order to continue to plan and build for the future, the current FMP, in conjunction with the college EMP and District Bond Plans, must be updated to reflect future program and service needs. We realize that in some areas, we have capacity load ratios that reflect an underutilization of the existing facilities. This means we will need to assess and realign the use of our buildings to effectively use the space that we have available in order to accommodate future programs, services, and growth.

Additionally, from our campus climate surveys, there appears to be a concern with employees as to whether we are providing a safe, secure, and healthy learning and working environment. There are also concerns regarding the maintenance of the facilities and whether we are evaluating the use of facilities and making needed improvements. To address these concerns, beginning in 2014-15, Administrative Services began issuing an annual survey to obtain input from faculty, staff, and students on the services provided by the division, which includes facilities and the sheriff’s department. The data obtained from these surveys are used as part of the program review process for each unit and help establish goals and benchmarks for the ensuing year. Review of goals and benchmarks are reviewed at the end of each year with the respective managers and the Vice President of Administrative Services to highlight progress or determine if any additional adjustments are required to improve unit outcomes.

Some of the dissatisfaction appears related to the addition of our new facilities. While new facilities were brought online, this did not result in any additional staffing being brought on to address the new workload required with the increase in square footage. The college will need to assess this as funding becomes available in order to adequately maintain both the existing and new structures. While basic custodial services in buildings are provided, at the current level of staffing, the college facilities have an average appearance, and response times to some issues can take as long as a month to resolve.

The inclusion of the distance education mode in facilities and capital planning is present. Any facilities, equipment, or technology that is needed for distance education can be requested through the program review process for an individual department, or, on a college wide basis, it can be addressed through the Technology or Distance Education committees and requested through the Academic Affairs or Administrative Services units. The focus of the College is to fund and provide resources for all of our programs and services, regardless of the mode of delivery of the program or service.
Standard III.B.4 Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

Starting in 2001, the District had an unprecedented bond program allowing it to renovate existing facilities and build new ones to current standards. Three separate bonds were issued from 2001 to 2008 for a combined total of $5.7 billion, resulting in funding for over 600 new construction and renovation projects for all nine colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC). The District’s long-range capital plans support each college’s institutional improvement goals and include total cost of ownership projections for new facilities and equipment.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. The October 2011 Master Building Program Budget Plan laid the foundation for an integrated planning and budgeting process driven by each of the nine colleges’ Educational Master Plans. These Educational Master Plans served as the basis for development of the colleges’ Facility Master Plans, each of which addressed the long-term, often 20-25 year, building and infrastructure needs of the applicable college. (III.B.4-1 LACCD Master Building Program Budget Plan, 10/19/11, p. ii-vii)

b. The District has worked to strengthen its long-range capital planning and ensure that projections include the total cost of ownership for new facilities and equipment. In January 2012, the Review Panel concluded that “...overall, the Building Program has achieved a good level of success in that a substantial majority of the projects have been successfully completed – compared to the projects experiencing problems (e.g., cost or time overruns, sunk-costs and re-design, litigation, etc.)...the Building Program has the potential to achieve the Program’s goals within the funds provided.” (III.B.4-2 Independent Review Panel Report, 1/4/12, p. 7)

c. The Review Panel recommended that “...with every new or renovated building proposed to the Board of Trustees, a total cost of ownership analysis should be included that projects the District’s budgeted operating costs for maintenance and operations (M&O), capital renewal, and staffing.” (III.B.4-3 Independent Review Panel Report, 1/4/12, p. 38)

d. In March 2013, the District developed a comprehensive plan for total cost of ownership which identified total cost of ownership elements, reviewed the status of existing and proposed facilities, benchmarked existing facilities operations, and developed processes to measure, monitor, and control both facilities costs and utilization. (III.B.4-4 Comprehensive Plan for Total Cost of Ownership, LACCD, 3/20/13)

e. The District’s April, 2013 Special Report to the ACCJC addressed the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) issue raised in the LACCD Bond Audit issued by the State Controller. The report clearly demonstrated the District’s consideration of TCO systematically. The District defined the Total Cost of Ownership elements as 1) acquisition; 2) daily maintenance; 3)
periodic maintenance; 4) utility costs; 5) capital renewal costs; and 6) end-of-life costs to inform its decision-making about facilities and equipment. (III.B.4-5 Accreditation Special Report, LACCD, 4/1/13); (III.B.4-6 FMPOC Meeting Minutes, 3/26/14); (III.B.4-7 Total Cost of Ownership presentation, 3/26/14)

f. The District continues to research maintenance and operations (M&O) costs to identify more cost-effective and cost-savings measures for adoption, to reduce TCO. Examples include the District Technology Implementation Strategy Plan; Connect LACCD Project; Facilities Lifecycle and Custodial and Building Maintenance Analysis; Custodial Services Enhancement Program; and Districtwide Energy Measurement and Demand Response Analysis. (III.B.4-8 Technology Implementation Plan, 4/17/13); (III.B4-9 Connect LACCD Feasibility Report, 6/14/14); (III.B.4-10 Facilities Lifecycle Review and Custodial and Building Maintenance Analysis, 5/28/14); (III.B.4-11 Custodial Services Enhancement Program, 7/23/14); (III.B.4-12 Districtwide Energy Measurement and Demand Response PowerPoint, 10/22/14)

g. In April 2014 the Board approved the Facilities Master Planning & Oversight Committee’s (FMPOC) resolution to “Affirm its Commitment to Protect Capital Investments through Understanding and Management of Total Cost of Ownership” to ensure this policy guides the District’s long-range planning. (III.B.4-13 Board Minutes, 4/30/14)

h. The Board, at the recommendation of FMPOC, has implanted an incremental approach to the Connect LACCD project, which was established to improve the technology infrastructure connecting its headquarters and satellite facilities. Utilization and use of statistics are routinely reviewed and evaluated as a part of the Total Cost of Ownership. (III.B.4-14 Board Agenda, 7/9/14); (III.B.4-15 Board Agenda, 4/15/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

Propositions A and AA and Measure J gave the District unprecedented funding, but also required an unanticipated level of planning and oversight. Total cost of ownership issues raised in 2012 have been resolved, and as a result, the District has strengthened its long-range capital planning process, leading to better oversight, coordination, and ongoing efficiencies in support of its educational and strategic goals. The Board’s April 2014 passage a resolution related to Total Cost of Ownership demonstrates its ongoing commitment to controlling and reducing these costs for the benefit of the District and students. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard III.B.4

III.B.4-1 – LACCD Master Building Program Budget Plan, 10/19/11, p. ii-vii
III.B.4-3 – Independent Review Panel Report, 1/4/12, p. 38
III.B.4-4 – Comprehensive Plan for Total Cost of Ownership, LACCD, 3/20/13
III.B.4-5 – Accreditation Special Report, LACCD, 4/1/13
III.B.4-6 – FMPOC Meeting Minutes, 3/26/14
III.B.4-7 – Total Cost of Ownership presentation, 3/26/14
III.B.4-8 – Technology Implementation Plan, 4/17/13
III.B.4-9 – Connect LACCD Feasibility Report, 6/16/14
III.B.4-10 – Facilities Lifecycle Review and Custodial and Building Maintenance Analysis, 5/28/14
III.B.4-11 – Custodial Services Enhancement Program, 7/23/14
III.B.4-12 – Districtwide Energy Measurement and Demand Response PowerPoint, 10/22/14
III.B.4-13 – Board Minutes, 4/30/14
III.B.4-14 – Board Agenda, 7/9/14
III.B.4-15 – Board Agenda, 4/15/15

Standard III.C. Technology Resources

Standard III.C.1.
Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the institution’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Identification of technology needs
- Educational and Strategic Master Plan goals and objectives (link to ESMP)
- Technology Resources Plan action plans in support of the ESMP (link to Tech Resources Plan)
- Program review and unit planning objectives resulting in resource requests for information technology (link to Integrated Planning Handbook)
- District Technology Refresh Cycle (link to this document)
- The College uses data to identify technology needs and evaluate effectiveness (link to LACC Campus Climate Surveys in 2014 and 2015; 2014 LACCD Student Survey; 2015 Admin Services IT Survey)

Effectiveness of technology in meeting technology needs
- The Technology Steering Committee has responsibility for oversight of ESMP objectives (link to Tech Steering Operating Agreement)
- ESMP objectives have associated measures, which are assessed annually (link to Tech Steering annual assessment; link to ESMP Progress Report - Committee Updates in SharePoint)
- Completion of requests through the IT Help Desk (link to IT Help Desk)

Decisions on use and distribution of technology resources
Resource request prioritization process (link to resource request summaries from 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16)

Action plan: Mubarakshin to run a report that pulls out the IT requests from those summaries?

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Technology Steering Committee evaluates data as part of its role as the body that oversees the application of technology towards the execution of the College mission and realization of the ESMP (link to Technology Steering Committee Operating Agreement). The committee creates and oversees the Technology Resources Plan, which provides supporting strategies to the objectives outlined in the ESMP (link to Technology Resources Plan). The Technology Resources Plan includes an assessment of the previous technology plan, assesses trends and current technology resource levels, and identifies the goals for the next cycle in support of the ESMP. [link] The Technology Steering Committee also serves as a resource for technology services, facilities, hardware, and software needed by all divisions, units, and programs, and as the advisory committee to the Information Technology department.

Data evaluated by the Technology Steering Committee includes the results of program review (link to PRE summary of all technology requests) and satisfaction surveys (link to surveys). With support from the District Tech Council, the Technology Steering Committee reviews industry standards and best practices to support College technology services, facilities, hardware, and software needs. The College has a policy for replacement of technology that addresses the management, maintenance, and operation of technology infrastructure and equipment (Information Technology Resource Plan, Appendix B). The Technology Steering Committee reviews and analyzes Help Desk activity reports and summaries of satisfaction surveys (see Tech Resources Plan).

The Bond Project has allowed the college to make significant improvements in its technology infrastructure. The Bond Steering Committee has representation from all campus constituencies and is the primary body that oversees the Bond projects. The IT Manager is a member of all bond projects, attends facilities PMO meetings, and is a resource on the Bond Steering Committee. In the past few years the College has upgraded systems including network storage, high-end physical servers, and virtual software. The College has increased its use of SharePoint for the collection of data. In the 2013-14 and 2014-15 fiscal years, the College purchased 400 computers to replace old computers in classrooms and offices, based on age (get document available that shows age of our computers—is it in the Plan? Check).

The IT Department supports the College in making decisions about technology services, facilities, hardware, and software. The College has standards for common equipment such as computers and printers (link). If a request is outside the standard, the unit provides justification and the IT Manager determines the appropriateness of the purchase. IT staff continually reviews high quality and reliable industry standard providers that are within the budget, and makes recommendations to the Vice President of Administrative Services. The College has supporting contracts in place for such items as the phone system, MS systems, firewall, core switch, MS...
software, Adobe software, Etudes, and OmniUpdate. Software updates are pushed out on a regular basis.

The College has 62 labs with between 5-50 computers each, and the Library and Student Union have open labs for all students. The College recently decided to utilize Office 365 with email, storage, and web apps to establish better communication with constituencies. The College provides software for faculty including Microsoft Office and Adobe Suite. Faculty have access to a computer as required by contract (link to page in AFT contract) and access to a centralized copy center. The Teaching Learning Center provides access to computers and printers and support for all faculty and staff. Trainings include MOUS certification and on the Adobe Master Collection Suite. Get a list of all trainings that have occurred in the TLC (Pamela Atkinson). Is there a follow-up survey to evaluate the quality of the training? Get a list of all IT trainings that occurred in professional development. Is there a follow-up survey to evaluate the quality of the training?

Whether technology is provided directly by the institution or through contractual arrangements, are there provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security?

An overwhelming percentage of students (87%) agree that instructors adequately use available technology in and out of the classroom. A majority of students (67%) agree that College equipment and labs are adequate and up-to-date. An even higher percentage (74%) agree that the College’s Wi-Fi is accessible and secure. (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #21m, #21n, #27e). These numbers reflect the fact that due to the Bond Program all new and modernized buildings now have wireless and 80-85% of the campus now has wireless coverage. The Facilities Plan is for the College to be close to 100% by the end of the Bond Project.

Add an analysis of the 2015 Admin Services survey results—click here for the results

The College keeps track of all work orders, including whether the requestor was notified of the work having been completed. All of the over 1,500 work orders placed in 2014-15 were completed. A majority of employees (64%) agree that units continue to use the program review process to address technology needs and the number is likely to increase as the College becomes increasingly familiar with the program review cycle. A similar percentage agrees that the institution uses the results of the evaluation for the basis of improvement. An overwhelming majority (86%) of employees agree that technology resources help students meet their learning needs. A similar amount (85%) agree that technology resources help faculty meet their teaching needs. Employees are in general satisfied with the amount and quality of training they have received in information technology (70%), but the comparatively low percentage indicates the College could provide additional education on the types of trainings available. Employees are satisfied with the timeliness and quality of IT support and maintenance (80%). (Add these questions to the 2015 admin services survey to get comparative numbers) (link to 2014 Campus Climate Survey) All action plans resulting from the analysis of information technology trends are documented in the Tech Resources Plan, which includes measures that will be tracked annually (link to Tech Plan).
Distance education. Training on Etudes occurs in the Teaching Learning Center and is required along with pedagogy training for all DE faculty (DE Handbook). How do we know our tech accommodates our DE programs? We do not, DE is outsourced. We do not rely on campus Tech to provide any support for LMS. Tech takes care of SIS issues. How often do we review the effectiveness of Etudes and Moodle? Ask Pamela Atkinson/Carlos. What does effectiveness mean in this context and for who? The district had a survey that may have included some of this material.

The College evaluates the effectiveness of technology in meeting its DE needs and tracks how effectively those needs are met by _____

The College uses the program review and resource request process to make decisions about technology services, hardware, and software to ensure that the needs of faculty responsible for DE are met.

The College has a formal contract with Etudes to provide support for DE courses. The contract specifies that Etudes is responsible for hosting, backup, monitoring, upgrades, and faculty support (Etudes Contract, p. 13).

Quality Focus Essay Plan. 1.4.2 Utilize room scheduling software. software needed to support the institution’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services; instruction and support for staff in using the software.

[Wanner to write this]

Standard III.C.2.
The institution continuously plans for, updates, and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality, and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Robust, current, sustainable, and secure technical infrastructure that provides maximum reliability

- The College has an IT Department whose mission is to deliver high quality technical leadership, resources, and services to students, faculty and staff in support of the college mission (link to IT Department mission and learning outcomes)
- The College has a Technology Steering committee that plans and coordinates the application of technology to the execution of the ESMP; serves as a resource on technology-related issues for all divisions, units, and programs; serves as the advisory committee to the IT Department; and reviews and makes recommendations towards the implementation of the Technology Resources Master Plan (link to Tech Steering Committee operating agreement)
• The College has ongoing Technology Resources Plans and tracks completion of actions (link to all recent Tech Resources Plans)
• District Technology Refresh Cycle (link to this document)
• College IT Standards (link to them)

Technology decisions based on the results of evaluation of program and service needs
• The College has a clearly defined integrated planning process that links program review and resources request prioritization (Integrated Planning Handbook)
• The IT Department continually assesses its learning outcomes and participates in comprehensive and annual program review (link to unit planning objectives)

Prioritization of technology
• Resource request prioritization process (link to resource request summaries from 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16)
• The College engages in annual campus climate surveys and administrative services surveys focusing on IT (link to survey results)

Action plan: Mubarakshin to run a report that pulls out the IT requests from those summaries; and run a report that summarizes how much money was requested through the resource request process to IT purchases? If not, just clean up the display on SharePoint with the RR prioritization summary

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Technology Steering Committee, a standing subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), creates and oversees the Technology Resources Plan (link to operating agreement). The Technology Resources Plan describes the planning procedures towards developing the College’s short and long-term technology resources needs. The Plan aligns with the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan Vision 2020 focus on learning, assessment, teaching, infrastructure, and productivity, as well as the College’s own ESMP. The Plan outlines how the College updates and replaces technology to ensure accomplishment of the College mission, improvement of institutional effectiveness, and academic quality. Current goals are to utilize technology to create dynamic face-to-face and online learning environments; maintain a consistent, safe, secure, and reliable technology infrastructure; and maintain and upgrade or replace technology infrastructure and equipment. (link to Tech Resources Plan)

The Technology Resources Plan includes an assessment of the previous technology plan, identification of current technology resources and staffing levels, review of staff development and trainings related to technology, and analysis of satisfaction surveys. This assessment results in new goals with measurable outcomes. The Plan is assessed based on a review of performance measures in alignment with the ESMP. The Technology Steering Committee reviews measure updates for all goals and makes recommendations for revising Technology Resources Plan goals and/or measures, identifies areas of concern that warrant immediate attention for the college, and makes recommendations through the college governance structure for actions to improve measures. (link to ESMP Progress Report - Committee Updates in SharePoint). The committee does an annual assessment of the Plan (link to annual assessments).
At the unit level, outcomes assessment and program review allows the College to identify IT needs and prioritize resource requests in support of the ESMP and Technology Resource Plan. This review determines how effective the College is meeting its technology needs and ensures that the College’s technology decisions are based on institutional priorities.

**Distance Education.**

- *How does the institution make decisions about use and distribution of its technology resources in relation to DE? DE LMS is outsourced. Right... but who makes the decisions? Carlos?*
- *What provisions has the institution made to assure a robust and secure technical infrastructure, providing maximum reliability for students and faculty when offering its DE courses and programs? (Federal Regulation) Etudes LMS provides such security with LACCD servers.*
- *What evidence is there that the institution bases its technology decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs and that the evaluation includes the needs related to DE? Again DE LMS is outsourced. The campus purchases LMS, is that the question?*

**Standard III.C.3.**

*The institution assures that technology resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Management, maintenance, and operation of technological infrastructure and equipment

- The College uses a Help Desk to track completion of IT requests (Summary of Help Desk requests)
- The College has defined IT standards

Reliability and emergency backup

- LACC policy on tracking mechanisms
- *Policies on student email use?*
- Security procedures?
- *Others?*

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

On the main campus, IT staff maintains the technology. Users request support for technology through the online IT Help Desk system, which allows users to submit requests and for the College to assign responsibility to appropriate staff members based on the type of request (*link to summary*).
As part of the planning for the Bond project, all new and modernized buildings have upgraded network equipment, including meeting required standards for cabling, wireless, MDF/IDF, power and connectivity, drops and cables in rooms, smart podiums, and physical security. ([link to College IT Standards](#)). The number of fire alarm, access control systems, and security cameras has increased by 100% over the last few years [data source?]. After completion of the Bond Master Plan the College will be at 100% coverage for wireless and smart classrooms.

The data center is in a single building, backups are made daily and spread throughout buildings on campus, and all servers in the data center are secured. The campus network has a secure firewall. All new portable devices have tracking mechanisms for security purposes ([new internal LACC policy](#)). The College recently purchased new data backup software to improve server backup.

The College does not have any off-campus sites or centers or international sites. All off campus locations are part of the LAUSD, which provides and maintains its technology.

**Standard III.C.4.**
The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators, in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

How the College assesses the need for IT training for students and personnel

- Juan Mendoza? Pamela Atkinson?

List of technology trainings provided to students and personnel

- **Summary of staff development and other trainings on technology** ([Pamela Atkinson](#))

How the College ensures that the training and technical support it provides for faculty and staff are appropriate and effective. How it knows the training is effective. How the training is evaluated.

- The College has a Teaching Learning Center (TLC) that provides faculty and staff with training and technical assistance to support instruction, with an emphasis on using technology to increase teaching effectiveness and student learning.
- xxx

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

All College employees have access to training in the Teaching Learning Center (TLC) on Electronic Curriculum Database, ESC, the Portal (for PCR, work requests, Business Warehouse), LACCD Faculty System, LACC online forms, District online forms, PeopleAdmin, Etudes, textbook requisitions, and email. The TLC also provides training for personnel including MOUS,
Microsoft IT Academy and exam preparation for MOUS. The technology in the TLC was renovated in 2013-14 through a Title 5 grant.

Student training on technology occurs in the main Library (research training); OSS High Tech Lab; basic skills courses in technology offered by Learning Skills, CAOT, and CSIT; STEM Academy; and College computer labs in the Library, Math Pi Shop, and Student Union. Instructional assistants provide support for these student labs. Students are satisfied with the number of labs on campus (67%) (LACCD Student Survey Results, 2015).

Other technology trainings provided at workshops and committee meetings:
- Standalone training (Curriculum Committee)?
- Program review interface and use of SharePoint (PRE, Department Chairs Council, Department Chairs Caucus)
- Others?

Although less than 50% of students know who to contact if they have a problem with their LACCD email account (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #27b), this issue is being addressed through the improvement of the information posted online as it relates to the more common services provided to the students like Office 365, wireless access, computer lab access and the tracking of time for lab hours (http://www.lacitycollege.edu/services/studemail/emailntc.html).

We’re also in discussions to see how we can create an official helpdesk for the students where they can get assistance with any of the resources we provide and walk them through the process as needed. The IT department is currently filling in a best as possible but there’s a need for more resources in order to be able to provide the right level of support needed to the student population of over 18,000. ______xx Juan Mendoza (JM: see comments provided)

**Distance education.** The Teaching Learning Center provides faculty training and support for Etudes and online pedagogy for DE courses. Individual faculty provide orientation to students for their DE courses.

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** 1.4.2 Utilize room scheduling software. *software needed to support the institution’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services*: instruction and support for staff in using the software

[Wanner to write this]

**Standard III.C.5.**
*The institution has policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:
How the College makes decisions about use and distribution of its technology resources

- **Administrative Regulations**
  - Use of District and College Computing Facilities (formerly E-76) (B-27)
  - Network Security Policy (B-28)
- **Through the Bond Project the College has developed technology standards—find the link...it’s up there somewhere**
- **Distance Education**
  - The College has a policy requiring all fully online and hybrid distance education courses to utilize a common course management system housed on the LACC server or delivered by a vendor under contract with LACC (Distance Education Handbook, p.10)
  - The College’s Regular Effective Contact Policy states that the frequency of contact in DE courses will be at least the same as would be established in a traditional course (Distance Education Handbook, pp.32-33; Appendix B, Appendix C)
  - The College requires proficiency in the approved Course Management System, DE pedagogy training, and explains to faculty how to develop a course site (Distance Education Handbook, pp.7-9)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

All employee computers on campus show a brief summary advisor all users about the B-27 and B-28 policies. The user then has to click OK before she/he can proceed to use the computer which also means that they agree to those guidelines.

The technology standards are normally used to provide guidance and the minimum requirements for all areas of IT. These standards are included with the bid package for all construction projects which has made a significant difference to ensure that all buildings have an adequate level of infrastructure to provide the right level of services to the students, faculty and staff when the project is completed.

*Write this. Juan Mendoza to provide input. (JM: see comments above)*

87% of students think instructors adequately use available technology in and out of the classroom (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #23i)

**Distance education.**

Regular and effective contact must be instructor initiated. The College has developed suggestions for expected interaction with students (Distance Education Handbook, Appendix B and Appendix C). The College requires that faculty teaching online or hybrid courses for the first time complete professional development training specifically in online pedagogy.

*What provisions has the institution made to assure a robust and secure technical infrastructure, providing maximum reliability for students and faculty when offering its DE/CE courses and programs?* The LMS is outsourced and the District provides a secure SIS migration of students to LMS on a daily basis.
Standard III.D. Financial Resources

Standard III.D.1.
Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard.

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

As recently as the 2013-14 fiscal year the College was able to generate sufficient resources to support and make improvements within its various programs, services, and instructional delivery methods, and maintain a balanced budget. The College was able to accomplish this despite declining enrollment since 2010-11. For fiscal year 2014-15, however, the College received unrestricted general fund resources totaling approximately $57.8 million; these resources were less than the $60.1 million in expenses that were incurred for the year. This deficit was the direct result of the College not earning approximately $2.9 million in growth funding which it was expected to generate in 2014-15.

As a result of this deficit, the College has begun to re-evaluate its enrollment management practices, and fiscal monitoring and reporting will take place each term to ensure that the hourly instructional budget stays within its budgeted resources. Pursuant to Board policy, the College is required to repay the debt incurred from 2014-15, and we are preparing to do so by making cost adjustments where needed in personnel, reducing operational costs, and in adjusting the academic schedule to reduce hourly instructional costs through increased productivity.

In the past, the College has utilized rollover scheduling, a manual room scheduling process, and has operated at less than the recommended average of 34 students per section. These past practices, with declining enrollment, will not allow the college to continue to be fiscally solvent. The College has begun the process to select and implement a new room management software system to assist with improving classroom utilization efficiency. This will assist the college with improved scheduling, help us maximize our course offerings and increase enrollment, and assist with lowering our hourly instructional costs. These practices will then allow the college to assess and redirect resources to assist with needed improvements in other college areas.

Restricted fund sources; such as instructional equipment and library materials funding, have been instrumental in helping the college allocate one-time resources to purchase equipment and provide support to our college library. Other restricted fund sources, such as Equity and Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) funds, have been used to help the college expand and
implement new programs and services to improve student access and success. The expected outcomes from the use of these restricted funds are outlined in the college Equity and SSSP plans, with the Academic and Student Services groups responsible for implementation, meeting as needed to revise and update the respective plans and stay within the allocated resources. Each year, the college Strategic Planning and Budget Committees, which is comprised of members from each of the college participatory governance groups, set academic and financial planning goals for the college to address short and long term college objectives and needs. In these groups, a review of the college mission and priorities are discussed, with recommendations forwarded to the College Council, which is also comprised of various members of the college. In planning this past year, the college agreed that maintaining a balanced budget was the top priority for the College. However, given the circumstances from the past fiscal year, it is likely this will again surface as a top objective for the College, as debt repayment has a direct impact on the amount of funds that could be available for expanding current programs and services, or making needed campus improvements to the facilities or technology.

Additionally, the Budget Committee meets monthly to discuss the annual budget, adjustments to the current budget, and projected impacts to future funding. The committee also serves to make recommendations on future funding priorities based upon projected needs. In addition, as a part of the annual program review and planning process, the committee reviews and discusses resource requests from each of the College’s operational areas.

This review uses an agreed upon scoring matrix which helps assess how each request meets with specified criteria; health and safety, legal mandates, specific program accreditation requirements, educational and strategic master plan compliance, operational need, student success, or board and/or College goals and objectives. Once prioritized, and after requests are ranked according to one-time or ongoing college needs, requests are forwarded to the college President for review and approval, and based upon available funding, are included in the following year’s budget.

The College has processes and practices to ensure that available financial resources are used to support student learning programs and services that improve student outcomes and institutional effectiveness. The College also provides financial support to its distance education offerings to increase access and success by satisfying student demand, giving students more options to receive college credits, and improving the likelihood of degree and certificate completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>DE Sections</th>
<th>Total Section</th>
<th>DE Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3602</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3919</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3931</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>3546</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3330</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sufficient funding is also provided to fund other keys areas of the institution, which include maintenance and operations. The college has made numerous improvements to programs and
services with the allocation of resources through our annual program review process. The College has also demonstrated sound financial management practices by ending its fiscal years with positive budget balances. While the last fiscal year was a challenge, by improving our enrollment management practices, we are confident that we will again make the necessary improvements to remain fiscally solvent.

**QFE Plan:** Develop institutionalize an enrollment management plan to improve financial stability and better support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Improved enrollment management will lead to increased enrollments, which will increase discretionary funds, improve financial stability, and allow the College to better support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness [Dan Wanner to write]

**Standard III.D.2.**
*The institution’s mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College mission and goals serve as the foundation for program and financial planning and are reflected in our 2014-20 Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP). The ESMP is reflective of all program and unit plans, which must be aligned with the college mission and goals, in order to receive consideration for institutional funding whether ongoing or for one-time needs. In the planning process, goals and objectives are discussed and recommended by the Strategic Planning Committee and the College Council. These recommendations are forwarded to the college President, who then reviews, and if in agreement, approves the recommendations. The mission and goals are part of the foundation that help the college President establish priorities for our programs and services, and address short-term, and long-term college goals and objectives.

College financial goals are discussed within the Budget Committee, which makes recommendations to the College Council, and subsequently to the college President. This committee considers the college mission and goals in its deliberations, and they discuss and review financial circumstances that could impede progress towards any goal or objective of the college. As needed, the committee helps set financial expectations for the college, and helps monitor the progress made towards achievement of those goals. This committee reviews requests generated through the program review process, and evaluate how these requests will bring about proposed improvements in student access and success.
The college resource allocation process is linked to program review and the ESMP process, which allows departments and operating units to identify short term and long term plans, including equipment, software and staffing needs. All resource allocations requests must be linked to planning goals and be consistent with and supportive of the college mission and ESMP. Requests for increased operating costs, faculty and classified staff, or other additional resources, are prioritized and recommended for funding based on how unit planning objectives help the college implement the ESMP. Resource allocation requests are generally not given consideration unless they have been documented in a department/operating unit ESMP.

The annual College budget, which is reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, allows the college to meet its mission, goals, and implement the objectives of the ESMP. College and district personnel also routinely report to the Board Finance Committee and the Board of Trustees on the financial status of the college and its planning efforts. Budget updates, which include quarterly financial reports, and any budget revisions that occur during the fiscal year, are reviewed and discussed by the Board of Trustees. Any financial issues that arise at the College are brought before the Board of Trustees for additional discussion, planning, and implementation by the College.

Financially, during the period of 2011-12 through 2013-14, the College was able to generate unrestricted, general fund ending balances of ($88,861), $896,991, and $169,702. In 2014-15, the College ended the year with a deficit of over $2.4 million. This was the result of not achieving projected enrollment growth. Pursuant to Board policy, the college will need to repay this advanced funding back to the District. To ensure that this does not occur again, the College has begun to evaluate its enrollment management strategy, and we have included this debt in future financial planning.

Additionally, as a part of budget development, the college is required to set aside one percent of our annual overall budget for any unforeseen emergencies. In 2014-15, this amount was approximately $692,638. The use of this emergency fund is subject to review and approval from the Chancellor’s Office.

Additionally, in the event of financial emergency beyond the means of the college, the District maintains a general/contingency reserve of ten percent. This amount is approximately $34,440,765 for the 2015-16 fiscal year. These funds may assist the college in the event of any emergency that cannot be addressed within college resources, or through the District’s insurance policy. The District maintains a strong cash position and has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability and cover any potential risks or unforeseen emergencies.

Given the level of college and District reserves, the college does not have any Certificates of Participation, or other outstanding loans to cover its anticipated expenses. The only outstanding local debt that the College has is its repayment of its past and current deficit. Once local debt is repaid however, it will provide the College with new resources, which can be re-allocated to meet program and service needs using the resource allocation process followed by the Budget Committee.
**QFE Plan.** Develop and institutionalize an enrollment management plan to improve financial stability and better support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Once the enrollment management plan is institutionalized, the College will have a new set of procedures that will provide long-term financial stability.

**Standard III.D.3.**
The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

All college departments and programs participate in an annual program review process which assists the departments, programs, and the college with financial planning and resource allocations. Faculty, staff, and administrators participate in this process, with resource requests for faculty sent to the college faculty hiring committee for review and recommendation, and requests for classified staffing, equipment, and supplies sent to the college Budget Committee for their review and recommendation.

The Budget Committee meets monthly and discusses the annual budget, any adjustments to the current budget, and projected impacts to future funding. The committee also makes recommendations on future funding priorities based upon projected needs. In their review of resource allocation requests, the committee makes sure that requests are in alignment with institutional priorities established by the college. The committee then makes recommendations for augmentations, or if necessary, reductions for the following fiscal year.

In their review, the committee uses an agreed upon scoring matrix which helps assess how each request meets with specified criteria such as health and safety, legal mandates, specific program accreditation requirements, educational and strategic master plan compliance, operational need, student success, or board and/or college goals and objectives. Once prioritized, and after ranking requests according to one-time or ongoing college needs, requests are forwarded to the college President for review and approval.

Upon conclusion of the resource planning process, and to ensure that all groups involved in college planning are informed, the Budget Committee forwards the resource recommendations to the College Council for their review and comment. This review serves as an additional validation that resource recommendations support our mission and goals, short and long-term planning needs, provide items to improve the student learning environment, and ensures that all college constituents are included and participate in the financial planning done by the committee.

**Standard III.D.4.**
Institutional planning reflects a realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

In monthly Budget Committee meetings, members receive information on projected revenue, expenditures, and review items that may have future impacts on projected resources. These items may include the projected effect of contractual agreements (i.e., salary increases), health and welfare increases, and other long-term liabilities, such as increased pension (i.e., PERS or STRS) or, Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) costs. Budget presentations are also provided each year to the committee, as well as discussed at College Council, which review the January 10 Governor’s Budget, the May Revise, and the final enacted State Budget and its projected impact on our future resources.

In the projected allocation of resources, members of the Budget Committee, as well as College Council, are reminded of the projected salary and benefits costs for all certificated and classified personnel. These are the first items that must be funded from our general fund resource allocation in order to help us meet our student learning, access, and success goals. The next items that are funded are maintenance and operational costs for facilities. The remaining resources, which are less than two percent of our annual budget, are provided to support other program and service costs such as tutorial services, office supplies, and some minor equipment.

Equity and SSSP funding is allocated by the College to departments and programs based upon approved program plans. These program plans are geared towards the improvement of student success goals, which include increasing transfer and graduation rates, as well as improvement in the matriculation of certain underrepresented groups from basic skills to general education courses. These items are given high priority within this funding, which complements the efforts of faculty and staff funded with unrestricted general fund.

The annual budget reflects the projected needs of instruction, student services, and general operations in order to support student learning, access, and success. All funds are allocated according to stated District and College goals and priorities, while also reflecting needed improvements identified through the annual audit process, unit program reviews, or College survey instruments. There are few, if any adjustments to these allocations, given that the majority (over 97 percent) of the budget is allocated towards fixed costs.

**Standard III.D.5.**

To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. The institution regularly
evaluates its financial management practices and uses the results to improve internal control systems.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College has established a process for establishing its resource priorities, which begin with the guiding principles from the Board of Trustees, followed by the goals and objectives set at the college through our various planning processes. While the college mainly relies on the general fund to support these priorities, the college does actively seek revenue and support from other sources, which include community and industry partnerships, rental of college facilities, Foundation support, and federal grants in order to meet our student learning objectives.

The College budget control system, SAP, is accessible to all users with budget responsibility. Training is provided by District and College staff to users, who are given access to view budgets, initiate purchase requisitions, and make changes within their allocations. Budget changes are subject to review by department managers, the respective Vice Presidents, with final postings review and processed at the District Budget office. The data within the system is updated daily, so that users can get timely information to assist with budget planning and implementation of program plans and services.

However, when you have many constituents competing for limited resources, there are many demands for funding beyond the resources that are available. Using the college planning priorities, and in evaluating the results of past planning, instructional and non-instructional resources are allocated based upon contractual obligations (i.e. faculty load), classes needed in the schedule for program completion, and student support services. We also budget to ensure that we have sufficient funding to support basic maintenance of facilities. The budget is a reflection of the limits that we have to work within.

As we are addressing issues such as the past deficit and decline in enrollment, we will have to continue in our current and future planning, to look at ways to redefine our limits, and find more effective and efficient delivery of our programs and services in order to not only manage the resources that we are given, but to continue to deliver necessary services to students that will help us improve our service outcomes, and increase their chances for success.

Each year, the College undergoes a comprehensive external financial audit to assess its internal controls and financial management practices. The College is also subject to internal auditing based on board direction, internal or external complaints or questions, or as follow up to previous external or internal audit findings. These reviews help assess whether the College has managed its general fund and other restricted funds and grants appropriately, consistent with regulatory guidelines from the state and federal government, and that we are following approved district policies and procedures for the expenditure of College funds.
Audit findings, responses, and any required follow up is communicated to the senior leadership of the College, as well as shared with staff responsible for the implementation of the response, and college participatory governance groups. Our annual audit reports are also shared with the Board of Trustees and the District Chancellor at a regularly scheduled public meeting. The annual audit report is also posted on the District website, and hardcopies are located in the President and Vice President of Administrative Services offices.

For 2013-14, the College had two findings regarding its compliance with state regulatory controls. These findings were in relationship to the use of “To Be Arranged” class rosters and eligibility for students enrolled in our Disabled Student Program & Services program. There were no other findings regarding the suitability of our internal controls. The College promptly responded with a corrective action plan to address the findings and is in compliance.

**Standard III.D.5** To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and uses the results to improve internal control systems.

The District has well-established and appropriate control mechanism and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision-making. The District regularly evaluates and updates its policies, financial management practices, and internal controls to ensure financial integrity and the responsible use of its financial resources.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. The Board established and regularly updates board rules which address financial management and internal control structures. **Board Rule 7608** requires the Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer (CFO) to generate interim financial reports, including current income and expenditures, which are submitted to the Chancellor monthly from October through June. The Chancellor, in turn, provides a District quarterly financial status report to the Board, in addition to monthly reports provided to the Budget and Finance Committee (BFC). These reports are widely disseminated and inform sound financial decision-making at the District and colleges. (III.D.5-1 Board Rule 7608); (III.D.5-2 Financial reports to the BOT, 5/13/15 and 8/19/15); (III.D.5-3 Financial reports to BFC; BFC minutes)

b. **Board Rule 7900** establishes the Internal Audit Unit as “an independent appraisal function within the LACCD to examine and evaluate the activities of the District...Internal Audit will report audit findings to the Board of Trustees’ Audit/Budget Committee no less than annually.” This Board Rule requires the Internal Audit Unit to ensure that “…financial statements and reports comply with Board policy, applicable government regulations and generally accepted accounting practices...internal accounting controls are adequate and effective...[and] operating policies promoting compliance...are enforced.” (III.D.5-4 Board
c. The District Budget Committee (DBC), Board Budget and Finance Committee (BFC), Board of Trustees, and the colleges receive financial information on a set schedule. Information on resource allocation, debt management, and financial management is routinely provided to the BFC and DBC so their committee members can be fully informed when making policy recommendations to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor. (III.D.5-7 LACCD Financial Report Information and Frequency, 2015)

d. The Office of Budget and Management Analysis develops districtwide revenue projections, and is also charged with the management of District resources. Since 1993, the District has followed a set budget development calendar which ensures full engagement of the colleges, Board of Trustees, and District office staff. The budget development calendar is evaluated and updated annually; the current version reflects oversight enhancements brought about by upgrades to the District’s financial operational system (SAP). The District also disseminates and trains employees to use its “Budget Operational Plan Instructions” manual to reinforce internal control procedures. (see Standard III.D.10). (III.D.5-8 LACCD Budget Development Calendar 2015-16, 6/26/15)

e. The District received an unmodified external audit, with no identified material weaknesses, for 2013 and 2014. The District has consistently had unqualified financial statements and unmodified external audit reports for the past 30 years. (III.D.5-9 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14, p.82 & 87); (III.D.5-10 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/09); (III.D.5-11 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/10); (III.D.5-12 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/11); (III.D.5-13 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/12); (III.D.5-14 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/13); (III.D.5-15 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14)

f. To ensure financial integrity of the District and the responsible use of its financial resources, District and college financial staff review best practices with both internal and external auditors, and revise procedures to strengthen internal controls. (III.D.5-16 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14, p.83 & 91-118)

g. To ensure the District’s internal control structure has the appropriate level of oversight, the Internal Audit Unit sets yearly review plans, providing Corrective Action Plan updates to the Board Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) on a quarterly basis. (III.D.5-17 Internal Audit Plan FY 2008-09); (III.D.5-18 Internal Audit Plan FY 2009-10); (III.D.5-19 Internal Audit Plan FY 2010-11); (III.D.5-20 Internal Audit Plan FY 2011-12); (III.D.5-21 Internal Audit Plan FY 2012-13); (III.D.5-22 Internal Audit Plan FY 2013-14, 9/11/13); (III.D.5-23 Internal Audit Plan FY 2014-15, 9/17/14); (III.D.5-24 Internal Audit Plan FY 2015-16, 4/15/15)

h. The Internal Audit unit conducted a Districtwide risk assessment study and determined the need for a comprehensive database which would strategically identify, and mitigate, risks.
This project is scheduled for implementation in FY 2015-2016. (III.D.5-25 Risk Assessment, 8/27/14)

i. The Central Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) continually monitors federal Perkins Loans and Nursing Loans. Student Financial Aid is audited annually by external auditors, as required by OMB Circular A-133, and is also subject to audits performed by grantors. The District has not received any material findings or questioned significant costs in the past ten years.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The District has a well-integrated financial management process that regularly evaluates its financial practices and internal control structure to ensure the financial integrity of the District. The Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer and colleges work together to ensure that dependable and timely information for sound financial decision-making is consistently available to all parties. The provision of accurate financial information on a regular schedule has enabled the District to make sound financial decisions and ensure the responsible use of its financial resources. The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence List for Standard III.D.5**

III.D.5-1 – Board Rule 7608
III.D.5-2 – BOT agendas and handouts, BOT, 5/13/15 and 8/19/15
III.D.5-3 – BOT agendas and handouts, BFC 3/11/15 and 5/13/15
III.D.5-4 – Board Rule 7900
III.D.5-5 – Board Rule 7900.10-7900.12
III.D.5-6 – BOT agenda, BF2, 12/3/14
III.D.5-8 – LACCD Budget Development Calendar 2015-16, 6/26/15
III.D.5-9 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14, p.82 & 87
III.D.5-10 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/09
III.D.5-11 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/10
III.D.5-12 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/11
III.D.5-13 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/12
III.D.5-14 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/13
III.D.5-15 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14
III.D.5-16 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14, p.83 & 91-118
III.D.5-17 – Internal Audit Plan FY 2008-09
III.D.5-18 – Internal Audit Plan FY 2009-10
III.D.5-19 – Internal Audit Plan FY 2010-11
III.D.5-20 – Internal Audit Plan FY 2011-12
III.D.5-21 – Internal Audit Plan FY 2012-13
III.D.5-22 – Internal Audit Plan FY 2013-14, 9/11/13
III.D.5-24 – Internal Audit Plan FY 2015-16, 4/15/15
III.D.5-25 – Risk Assessment, 8/27/14
Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

SAP financial documents are credible, accurate, and reflect allocations to departments based upon their staffing, office supply, instructional supply, equipment and maintenance, travel, and other program needs. Allocations reflect the resources required to support student learning and success.

Internal and external audits of the college budget have revealed no significant or material findings with internal controls or financial management. When minor findings are noted, the affected college departments or programs are notified, and the college Budget Office works with staff to make the necessary corrections to resolve issues. Findings, and corrective actions, are shared with college staff, the Board Finance Committee, and subsequently, the full Board of Trustees.

Standard III.D.7.
Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

Each month, the college Budget Committee meets to discuss the fiscal status of the college, work on planning items, or discuss findings from the internal or external audits. Information is presented for review and discussion as it is made available from either the state, federal government, or the District.

Annually, the Budget Committee is given a presentation of the annual State budget and college audit, which highlights any projected changes to college processes or budgeted resources. The committee also discusses future impacts as a result of Board of Trustee decisions; such as contractual salary increases, or, changes from the state Faculty Obligation Number, or FON, which impact fixed salary costs. Growth funding, and other one-time funding from the state, is
also discussed and reviewed as to how this will affect the college one-time resource allocation process. This information is shared prior to budget development, so that any recommendations or needed changes can be included within budget planning for the following year.

Audit findings, which are mandatory adjustments, are dealt with immediately. Any resources required to address an audit finding, if needed, is discussed with college management, affected staff, and the Budget Committee, in order to ensure that proper support is provided to address findings. Fortunately for the institution, past audit findings were related to process issues, and have not required any additional staffing or resources to address the audit findings. Corrections to bring the college into compliance were promptly made by existing staff.

**Standard III.D.8.**
The institution’s financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Each year, the College undergoes a comprehensive external financial audit of all its fund sources, in order to assess its internal controls and financial management practices. The College is also subject to internal auditing based on board direction, internal or external complaints or questions, or as follow up to previous external or internal audit findings. These reviews help assess whether the college has managed its general fund and other restricted funds and grants appropriately, consistent with regulatory guidelines from the state and federal government. This review also assesses whether we are following approved District policies and procedures for the expenditure of College funds.

Audit findings, responses, and any required follow up is communicated to the senior leadership of the college, as well as shared with staff responsible for the implementation of the response, and College participatory governance groups. Our annual audit reports are also shared with the Board of Trustees and the District Chancellor at a regularly scheduled public meeting. The annual audit report is also posted on the District website, and hardcopies are located in the President and Vice President of Administrative Services offices.

In additional to the annual auditing process, periodically we also receive special audits on special fund programs as an additional review to ensure compliance with special fund guidelines. All audits are monitored and reviewed by college and District Procurement staff, in addition to the college Vice President, Administrative Services.

Additionally, College staff involved with Procurement is required to attend annual training on District procurement policies and procedures. This provides staff with updates, highlights any
past issues found in audits, and serves to strengthen and improve our financial management practices.

The College also provides a process manual to assist staff with the internal control process. This manual is reviewed and updated annual by Business Office staff. Additionally, all Administrative Services units, which include the Business Office, Budget, and Purchasing, meet to review goals, objectives, outcomes, and identify improvements, as part of the annual program review process. This process assists the department with ensuring the financial integrity of the college and in implementing appropriate internal controls for our financial system.

---

**Standard III.D.8** The institution’s financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

The District evaluates its financial and internal control systems on a continuous cycle to ensure validity and effectiveness. Results from internal and external audits are used for improvement. When any deficiencies or material weaknesses are identified, the District promptly implements corrective action plans to resolve the deficiency. Where deficiencies are the result of issues with internal controls, policies, or procedures, remedial steps are taken before the next audit cycle.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. The District’s financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed annually by external auditors and internally on an ongoing basis and reported quarterly by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Treasurer. The District has had unqualified financial statements and unmodified audit reports for over 30 years (see Standard III.D.5). For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, the District did not have any material weaknesses identified in any of its external audits (see Standard III.D.5).

b. Material weaknesses were identified in the District’s external financial audits ending June 30, 2008 through 2012. In response, the District significantly improved its internal controls and implemented corrective actions. The District’s corrective actions resulted in the identification of less severe and fewer weaknesses during this same period. The June 30, 2011 audit found the District had one material weakness and four significant deficiencies (see Standard III.D.5). By June 30, 2014, the District had no material weaknesses and one significant deficiency (see Standard III.D.5). It is worth noting that the single deficiency identified in both 2013 and 2014 was not related to internal financial controls (see Standard III.D.5).

c. Information from external District audits is provided to the Budget Finance Committee (BFC), District Budget Committee (DBC), Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC), Board of Trustees and the CFO, and is used to evaluate and improve the District’s financial management and internal control systems. (III.D.8-1 BOT agenda-audit, 12/3/14); (III.D.8-2 – BFC minutes-audit, 12/3/14);
d. All audit reports are reviewed and progress towards implementation of corrective action plans for all audit findings are tracked by the Office of the CFO on an ongoing basis. External auditors review progress of corrective actions annually (see Standard III.D.5).

e. The District has annual external audits for its Bond Program. Bond expenditures have been consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions since the Program’s inception. The Bond Program has never received a qualified or modified audit. (III.D.8-3 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/09); (III.D.8-4 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/10); (III.D.8-5 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/11); (III.D.8-6 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/12)

f. Material weaknesses were identified in the Bond Program’s financial audits ending June 30, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In response, the District implemented corrective actions and strengthened internal controls and. No material weaknesses were subsequently identified in Bond Program financial audits for 2013 and 2014. (III.D.8-7 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/13); (III.D.8-8 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/14)

g. Financial and performance audits for the Bond Program are reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, the Board’s FMPOC, and the District Citizens’ Oversight Committee (DCOC). These committees also oversee and approve corrective actions to improve internal controls as needed. (III.D.8-9 FMPOC agenda, 11/19/14); (III.D.8-10 DCOC agenda, 1/30/15); (III.D.8-11 DCOC agenda, 3/13/15)

h. The Board recently amended BR 17300, which authorizes the Director of the Internal Audit unit, as the Bond Program Monitor, to ensure the Bond Program is performing with the utmost integrity. (III.D.8-12 BOT agenda, 6/24/15)

i. The District’s Internal Audit unit regularly reviews all business and finance systems to ensure compliance with relevant policies, procedures, laws, and statutory regulations. During the FY 2014-15, this unit conducted procurement audits for all nine colleges and the ESC. In response to findings, the District undertook a series of procurement trainings, which were mandatory for college and ESC staff. (III.D.8-13 DBC Procurement Audits Summary Report, 6/10/15); (III.D.8-14 Procurement Training 6/25/15)

j. In 2003, the District implemented the Systems, Applications and Products (SAP) financial software system, as a result of the District’s evaluation of its financial and internal control systems. Initially, SAP integrated and automated accounting and financial transactions. In 2005 the system was expanded to include personnel and payroll functions. The resulting integrated system allows real-time tracking, approval and posting of all expenditures, and strengthens the District’s financial and internal control systems. (III.D.8-15 SAP Business Warehouse Finance Screenshot); (III.D.8-16 SAP Business Warehouse HR Screenshot); (III.D.8-17 SAP Business Warehouse Instructional Screenshot); (III.D.8-18 SAP Business Warehouse Procurement Screenshot); (III.D.8-19 SAP Business Warehouse Time Screenshot)
k. In FY 2011, the District updated and reissued its accounting manual, which was designed to “...assist campus personnel with the preparation and management of documents, requests, and procedures that are handled in the Accounting and Business Office.” The manual is disseminated and used districtwide and has resulted in better internal controls along with a reduction in transaction processing time. (III.D.8-20 Business Office & Accounting Policies and Procedures Manual, updated 2/21/12)

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The District regularly evaluates its financial and internal control systems and assesses them for validity. The District substantially improved its internal controls in response to the ACCJC visiting team’s recommendation that “…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...” (III.D.8-21 ACCJC letter to District, 7/3/13)

By February 2014, the ACCJC stated that “the LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2 and...resolved the material weaknesses and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit. Appropriate systems have been implemented to prevent future audit exceptions.” The District continues to use the results of its assessment for improvement by implementing corrective actions for any findings or deficiencies noted in external audits, program audits, and grant funding sources. District policies and procedures are routinely reviewed and revised. The District meets this Standard. (III.D.8-22 ACCJC letter, 2/7/14)

**Evidence List for Standard III.D.8.**

III.D.8-1 – BOT agenda-audit, 12/3/14  
III.D.8-2 – BFC minutes-audit, 12/3/14  
III.D.8-3 – LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/09  
III.D.8-4 – LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/10  
III.D.8-5 – LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/11  
III.D.8-6 – LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/12  
III.D.8-7 – LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/13  
III.D.8-8 – LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/14  
III.D.8-9 – FMPOC agenda, 11/19/14  
III.D.8-10 – DCOC agenda, 1/30/15  
III.D.8-11 – DCOC agenda, 3/13/15  
III.D.8-12 – BOT agenda, 6/24/15  
III.D.8-13 – DBC Procurement Audits Summary Report, 6/10/15  
III.D.8-14 – Procurement Training 6/25/15  
III.D.8-15 – SAP Business Warehouse Finance Screenshot  
III.D.8-16 – SAP Business Warehouse HR Screenshot  
III.D.8-17 – SAP Business Warehouse Instructional Screenshot  
III.D.8-18 – SAP Business Warehouse Procurement Screenshot
The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College has sufficient cash flow to meet its obligations, and pursuant to District policy, retains one percent of its operating revenue, as a general reserve to support the college in the event of a financial emergency. In 2014-15, this amount was approximately $692,638. The use of this emergency fund is subject to review and approval from the Chancellor’s Office.

Additionally, the college President and the Vice President of Administrative Services are required to meet with District personnel to discuss potential expenses and risks that could have the college exceed its budget resources. If needed, the Vice President of Administrative Services works with college management to develop appropriate contingency plans to resolve any potential fiscal issues. College financial management plans are reviewed and recommended by the college President to the Chancellor, with final review and approval by the Board of Trustees.

In addition to the College reserve, the District maintains a strong cash position and has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability and cover any potential risks or unforeseen emergencies. There is a continuous review of financial conditions and state funding levels by the District fiscal team that provides timely, ongoing assessments of any potential financial risks.

Standard III.D.9 The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

Between FY 2008-09 and 2012-13, the District experienced more than $100 million in funding cuts. The District made significant reductions in class offerings, changed employee health benefits plans, and instituted stringent spending controls. Through these actions, and by maintaining healthy reserves, the District was able to weather the recession without furloughing or laying off permanent employees. The District reviews cash flow on a regular schedule and has maintained a sufficient cash flow, and healthy reserves which range from 13% to 17%.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cash Flow

a. The District has a strong financial position. The Board reviews and adopts the District’s Final Budget every September. (III.D.9-1 BOT agenda, BF1, Final Budget 2015-2016 PPT, 9/2/15)
b. In December 2014, the District’s bond rating was upgraded by Standard and Poor’s from AA to AA+. (III.D.9-5 LACCD Press Release on Bond Rating, 12/1/14)

c. Strong fiscal controls, coupled with an improved State economy, have left the District in a healthy financial condition. The District’s financial position and its planning activities to maintain financial stability for the past six years are described in the Executive Summary and Overview sections in the District’s Final Budgets. (III.D.9-6 Final Budget 2009-10, pp. i and 1); (III.D.9-7 Final Budget 2010-11, pp. i and 1); (III.D.9-8 Final Budget 2011-12, pp. i and 1); (III.D.9-9 Final Budget 2012-13, pp. i and 1); (III.D.9-10 Final Budget 2013-14, pp. i and 1); (III.D.9-11 Final Budget 2014-15, pp. i and 1); (III.D.9-12 Final Budget 2015-2016, 9/2/15, p. i and pp. 1-9)

d. The District issued $80 million in Tax Revenue Anticipation (TRANS) notes in 2012-2013 to provide operating cash for working capital expenditures prior to receipt of anticipated tax payments and other revenue. At the end of June 2013, $80 million in principal and $1.275 million in interest was due the next year. As of June 30, 2014, the TRANS debt was paid in entirety. Prior to this, the District had not issued any TRANS debt since 2004. Current cash flow projections do not indicate the District will need to issue any TRANS debt in the near future. (III.D.9-13 LACCD Financial Audit, June 30, 2014, p. 46)
**Reserves**

e. District reserve levels have increased in recent years. Each year, the District Budget Committee and the Board review reserve levels as part of the planning process to ensure financial stability for the District. Prior to 2012, the District maintained “...a District Contingency Reserve of 5% of total unrestricted general fund revenue at the centralized account level, and 1% of college revenue base allocation at the college level.” (III.D.9-14 Final Budget 2011-12, Appendix F, 8/5/11, p. 3)

f. In FY 2012-2013, the District had increased reserves to: “...District General Reserve of 5% and a Contingency Reserve of 7.5% of total unrestricted general fund revenue at the centralized account level, and 1% of college revenue base allocation at the college level.” (III.D.9-15 Final Budget 2012-13, Appendix F, 8/6/12, p. 4)

g. In the same year, the Board committed to increasing the deferred maintenance reserve fund from 1.5% of its annual budget to 2%. (III.D.9-16 Board Agenda, BT2, 5/23/12)

h. Since FY 2013-2014, the District has maintained “...a District General Reserve of six and a half percent (6.5%) and a Contingency Reserve of three and a half percent (3.5%) of total unrestricted general fund revenue at the centralized account level, and 1% of college revenue base allocation at the college level.” (III.D.9-17 Final Budget 2013-14, Appendix F, 8/21/13, p. 4); (III.D.9-18 Final Budget 2014-15, Appendix F, 9/3/14, p. 4); (III.D.9-19 Final Budget 2015-2016, Appendix F, 9/2/15, p. 3)

i. For 2015-2016, the District’s General Reserve is $41.48 million and represents 6.5 percent of the Unrestricted General Fund revenue budget. The District’s Contingency Reserve is $23.42 million and represents 3.5 percent of the Unrestricted General Fund revenue budget. (III.D.9-20 Final Budget 2015-2016, 9/2/15, p. 8)

j. The District Contingency Reserve is used to “...meet emergency situations or budget adjustments due to any revenue projection shortfalls during the fiscal year.” Use of reserves must be approved by a super-majority of the Board in accordance with Title 5, Section 58307. (III.D.9-21 Title 5, Section 58307); (III.D.9-22 BOT Agenda, BF2, 4/11/12); (III.D.9-23 BOT Agenda, BF2, 7/10/13); (III.D.9-24 BOT Agenda, BF2, 7/9/14)

**Risk Management**

k. Adequate property and liability insurance protects the District from unexpected costs due to property loss or legal action. The District has property and liability insurance, per occurrence, up to $600 million and $40 million respectively. The District’s “All Risk” property deductible is $25,000 per occurrence, and liability self-insurance retention is $1.5M per occurrence. Trustees are covered by the District’s liability insurance. (III.D.9-25 LACCD Certificate of Liability, 6/26/15)
l. The District is self-insured for up to $750,000 for each workers’ compensation claim, $1 million per employment practices claim, and $1.5 million for each general liability claim. The District maintains workers compensation insurance coverage through USI, with an excess workers compensation policy underwritten by Safety National. (III.D.9-26 LACCD Financial Audit, June 30, 2014, p. 45)

m. For the year ending June 30, 2014, the District made total premium payments of approximately $2.9 million for general liability and property claims. (III.D.9-13 LACCD Financial Audit, June 30, 2014, p. 46)

n. The Board adopted a policy on liability claims (Board Rule 7313) which requires that “all claims against the District for damages or injuries be reported to the Board of Trustees and administered by either the Office of General Counsel, the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources or the Director of Business Services, or their designees, as directed by the Chancellor.” (III.D.9-27 Board Rule 7313, updated 10/1/08)

o. A report of pending litigation is made monthly to the Board of Trustees and potential settlement funds are set aside. Any settlements approved by the Board of Trustees are then communicated in writing by General Counsel or Risk Management to the CFO’s office to formally allocate those funds. (III.D.9-28 Board Letter, 6/24/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

The District has fully demonstrated its ability to maintain adequate reserves, and continues to raise targeted levels to address future unforeseen needs. There has only been one instance of issuing TRANS debt within the last decade, and the District does not anticipate doing so again in the foreseeable future. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard III.D.9

III.D.9-1 – BOT agenda, BF1, Final Budget 2015-2016 PPT, 9/2/15
III.D.9-2 – Final Budget 2015-2016, 9/2/15, cover letter and p. i
III.D.9-4 – LACCD Financial Audit, June 30, 2014, p.6
III.D.9-5 – LACCD Press Release on Bond Rating, 12/1/14
III.D.9-6 – Final Budget 2009-10, pp. i and 1
III.D.9-7 – Final Budget 2010-11, pp. i and 1
III.D.9-8 – Final Budget 2011-12, pp. i and 1
III.D.9-9 – Final Budget 2012-13, pp. i and 1
III.D.9-10 – Final Budget 2013-14, pp. i and 1
III.D.9-11 – Final Budget 2014-15, pp. i and 1
III.D.9-12 – Final Budget 2015-2016, 9/2/15, p. i and pp. 1-9
III.D.9-14 – Final Budget 2011-12, Appendix F, 8/5/11, p. 3
III.D.9-15 – Final Budget 2012-13, Appendix F, 8/6/12, p. 4
Standard III.D.10.
The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

To assist with financial management, the College provides monthly and quarterly general fund reports to District budget staff, the college President, and the Budget Committee. This helps the College assess the use of its funds, for what purpose, and helps identify any future expenditure issues.

Student Services and Budget Office staff provide routine reports to federal grant agencies, including the Department of Education, on the status, operation, and compliance within our various Title IV programs and services.

The annual audit process helps the college with reviewing its compliance with the management of financial aid, outside grants and other externally funded programs, contracts, and the college foundation. The college Business Office also holds several investments in certificates of deposits. These assets are also subject to review during the annual audit.

The SAP financial system provides budget owners with daily access to review resources and assess their use. On a monthly basis, the college Budget office also reviews college resources to help assess potential problems and the effective use of resources. Budget access and financial reports help departments with financial and program planning. Potential issues are discussed
with department and management staff, with findings used to help with program management decisions. Quarterly financial reports are also generated and reviewed with senior management who then use the information to make changes and improvements, if needed, to programs and services.

The Budget Committee also reviews monthly financial reports, and if needed, discusses potential solutions and recommendations. On the District level, District budget staff provides periodic updates on program funding to the District Budget Committee, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees. The evaluation of these reports helps with the setting of policy and procedure changes that help improve the operation of programs and services.

**Standard III.D.10 The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.**

The District practices effective oversight and management of all financial resources. It also continually evaluates and, where needed, improves its oversight of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contracts, foundations, auxiliary organizations and institutional investments and assets. The District has both centralized and decentralized practices to ensure effective oversight.

**Evidence of Meeting Standard**

**Centralized District Oversight**

a. **Purchasing:** The District’s Contracts and Purchasing department procures goods and services not purchased directly by colleges. All contracts are reviewed to ensure they are in the District’s best interest in accordance with Board Rule 7100, as well as District policies and procedures related to procurement. (III.D.10-1 BR 7100); (III.D.10-2 Board agenda, 6/10/15); (III.D.10-3 Business Operations Policy and Procedures PP-04-00, PP-04-01, PP-04-07, PP-04-08, PP-04-09)

b. **Institutional Investments and Assets:** The District provides oversight in compliance with Board rules, District asset management policies and procedures, regulations, and any all contractual and funding requirements. (III.D.10-4 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14 and 2013, p. 25-26); (III.D.10-5 LACCD Asset Management Policies and Procedures, 4/3/09)

c. **Budget Oversight:** In accordance with Board Rule 7600, the Budget and Management Analysis Unit develops internal budget operational plans and provides guidance to colleges during the budget development process. The District budget calendar is updated and approved by the Board annually, and budget procedures are revised regularly to comply with federal, state, and local laws. The Unit designates a financial liaison for each fund and program at the colleges to safeguard against overspending. (III.D.10-6 Board Rule 7600);
(III.D.10-7 District Budget Operational Plan Instructions 2015-2016); (III.D.10-8 District Budget Calendar, 2015-2016); (III.D.10-9 College Financial Liaison Contact List, 2015-2016)

d. **Financial Aid:** The Central Financial Aid Unit coordinates the work of college Financial Aid offices and ensures college and District operations are legally compliant. The Unit implements standardized policies and procedures throughout the District; reconciles student loan programs, and provides guidance to college administrators and Financial Aid managers. (III.D.10-10 Screenshot of Financial Aid Management System Manual, 9/23/15)

e. **Specialized Employees:** The District has specialized employees who manage categorical, grants, and externally funded programs. Employees in the Specially Funded Program (SFP) classification establish operational policies and procedures for externally funded programs, and ensure compliance with all applicable rules and regulations. (III.D.10-11 SFP classifications)

f. All grant and externally funded programs also have a dedicated SFP (Specially Funded Program) accountant assigned to fiscal monitoring and oversight. (III.D.10-12 SFP Accountant List, June 2015)

g. **Audits:** Annual external audits are performed on all special or external funds, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) funds, categorical program funding, and capital bond programs (see Standard III.D.5). All special funds are regularly audited and demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices. Expenditures from special funds are made in a manner consistent with the intent and requirements of the funding source. (III.D.10-13 LACCD Annual Audit, June 30, 2014 and 2013, p. 73-81, 86-90)

h. **Auxiliary Organizations:** The District Foundation is the sole auxiliary organization for which the District is directly responsible. In March 2015, the Chancellor created a Senior Director of Foundation position for the District. This position is tasked with strengthening and standardizing foundation operations, procedures and policies; improving compliance with nonprofit regulations; strengthening District and college foundation’s infrastructure, and coordinating Districtwide advancement efforts. (III.D.10-14 Senior Director of Foundation job description, 3/24/15); (III.D.10-15 LACCD Foundation Summit, 4/17/15); (III.D.10-16 Presidents’ Council, 6/5/15)

*Decentralized District Oversight*

i. **Fiscal and Enrollment Management:** District fiscal and attendance accounting staff meet with college senior staff on a quarterly basis to review FTES (enrollment) and college fiscal projections, providing a framework for sound college enrollment and financial practices. (III.D.10-17 Budget Expenditure Projections, 2nd Qtr 2008-09); (III.D.10-18 ELAC2Q RecapPkt, 3/12/15)
j. **Auxiliary Organizations:** All college foundations have operating agreements with the District. Foundations are required to provide regular financial reports, reimburse the District for services, and operate in accordance with State law and District and nonprofit regulations. *(III.D.10-19 LACC Foundation Contract, 6/2015)*

k. College foundations receive annual external audits as required by law. Any identified deficiencies result in a Corrective Action Plan, which is implemented in a timely fashion. In addition, all LACCD foundations received internal audits in 2013-14, which will continue on a recurring basis. Internal auditors highlighted findings common to all foundations, and recommended corrective actions, which are scheduled to be completed by Fall 2015. *(III.D.10-20 Foundation Internal Audit Summary, 4/23/14); (III.D.10-21 Foundation Corrective Action Plans, 9/17/14)*

l. **Student ASO Funds:** Finances for Associated Student Organizations (ASOs) are governed by Board Rules 9200–9300 and Administrative Regulations S-1 to S-7. College Presidents review and approve all proposed ASO expenditures. Beginning in 2014-15, a schedule of internal audits for college ASOs was established by the Internal Audit unit. As the internal audits are completed, outcomes will be completed and reported to the BFC. *(III.D.10-22 BR 9200-9300); (III.D.10-23 Admin Regs S-1 to S-7); (III.D.10-24 Internal Audit Plan 2014-2015); (III.D.10-25 BFC docs 4/15/15-ASO Audits)*

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The District has a long history of compliance and sound financial management and oversight practices. Both colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) identify and correct deficiencies in internal controls and financial management practices when they are identified. Improved communication and coordination between District staff and the nine colleges will help ensure improved fiscal responsibility and compliance with all rules and regulations. The District meets this Standard.
Evidence List for Standard III.D.10

III.D.10-1 – Board Rule 7100
III.D.10-2 – Board agenda, 6/10/15
III.D.10-3 – Business Operations Policy and Procedures PP-04-00, PP-04-01, PP-04-07, PP-04-08,

PP-04-09
III.D.10-6 – Board Rule 7600
III.D.10-7 – District Budget Operational Plan Instructions 2015-2016
III.D.10-8 – District Budget Calendar, 2015-2016, 6/26/15
III.D.10-9 – College Financial Liaison Contact List, 2015-2016
III.D.10-11 – SFP classifications
III.D.10-12 – SFP Accountant List, June 2015
III.D.10-14 – Senior Director of Foundation job description, 3/24/15
III.D.10-15 – LACCD Foundation Summit, 4/17/15
III.D.10-16 – Presidents’ Council, 6/5/15
III.D.10-17 – Budget Expenditure Projections, 2nd Qtr 2008-09
III.D.10-18 – ELAC2Q RecapPkt, 3/12/15
III.D.10-19 – LACC Foundation Contract, 6/2015
III.D.10-20 – Foundation Internal Audit Summary, 4/23/14
III.D.10-21 – Foundation Corrective Action Plans, 9/17/14
III.D.10-22 – BR 9200-9300
III.D.10-23 – Admin Regs S-1 to S-7
III.D.10-25 – BFC docs 4/15/15-ASO Audits

Standard III.D.11.
The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College places a high level of importance on long-range planning in an effort to assure financial stability. The basis of long-range planning is formulated by the comprehensive 2014-20
Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP). Annually, the college Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), which is comprised of members representing all college constituencies, recommends to the College Council academic and financial planning priorities that will help address short and long term college objectives and needs in support of the mission and ESMP.

In 2014-15, the College agreed that maintaining a balanced budget was the top priority for the college. Balancing the budget will remain a priority for the College, as debt repayment has a direct impact on the amount of funds that could be available for expanding current programs and services. Additionally, each unit goes through an annual program review process where they evaluate program needs and existing resources, and if needed, make requests for additional resources to meet anticipated future needs, and unit planning objectives that are aligned with the ESMP.

Recommendations from the College Council are sent to the college President for review and approval. From these priorities, the Budget committee creates prioritized resource lists from requests generated through the annual program review process.

The College has also completed various long-term facility improvements that were identified in the Facilities Master Plan. These improvements replaced many aging facilities in order to provide modern facilities that align with institutional goals for student learning. Ongoing, and projected future, maintenance costs for college facilities are budgeted within the annual college budget.

Long-term health benefits, and retiree costs, such as OPEB expenditures, are centralized expenses that are budgeted at the District level. As these costs increase however, they could reduce the amount of available funding for the college. Annually, projected impacts from these costs are discussed at the College. If any adjustments were needed to balance the college budget, this would be discussed with the Budget Committee and College Council, with any recommendations from those groups, reviewed and approved by the college President.

---

Standard III.D.11 The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

The District has a well-coordinated and integrated budget planning system that takes into consideration both short-term and long-term financial issues. The District creates comprehensive income and cost projections on a regular basis that are used for budget planning, resulting in a long-standing culture of fiscal responsibility and solvency.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. The District maintains financial solvency by ensuring that all obligations are identified with accurate valuations. The District systemically identifies and evaluates its obligations on an annual basis. When needed, third party actuaries are engaged to establish the amounts of obligations. *(III.D.11-1 LACCD Financial Audit, p. 34-35, June 30, 2014)*

b. The District has maintained a history of positive net position. As of June 30, 2014, the District’s total net position was $743.6 million, an increase of $43.1 million over June 30, 2013 (see Standard III.D.9).

c. As of June 30, 2014, the District’s working capital (current assets minus current liability) was $132.9 million, with a cash and cash equivalent balance of $138.6 million. The District’s non-current assets are greater than non-current liabilities. The balance is sufficient to cover all obligations payable by the District including compensated absences, general liability workers’ compensation, and other post-retirement employee benefits. *(III.D.11-2 LACCD Financial Audit, p. 17-18, June 30, 2014)*

d. The District uses its existing governance structure to exchange information and seek recommendations from the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee in order to ensure budget priorities align with the District’s Strategic Plan’s goals, Board of Trustees’ goals, and the Chancellor’s recommendations. *(III.D.11-3 Final Budget 2015-2016, 9/2/15, pp. 1-10)*

e. The BFC reviews the five-year forecast of revenues, expenditures and fund balances to inform the District’s next fiscal year’s budget. *(III.D.11-4 Long Range Forecast, BFC, 3/11/15)*

f. Similarly, the DBC, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and the Chancellor make budget recommendations to the Board Budget and Finance Committee (BFC), prior to adoption of the final budget. *(III.D.11-5 DBC minutes, 4/22/15)*

g. The District’s budget planning priorities are informed by the Chancellor’s proposed recommendations, the funding of the District’s reserve policy, the alignment with the District’s Strategic Plan’s goals for restoring access and improving student success and equity, and securing the short-term and long-term financial strength of the District. *(III.D.11-6 Final Budget 2015-2016 PPT, 9/2/15, p. 15)*

h. The District’s Final 2015-2016 budget priorities address long-range financial obligations such as meeting the Full-time Faculty Obligation, addressing increases in CalSTRS and CalPERS contribution, expansion of basic skills program delivery, covering salary increases, and ensuring funding is adequately provided for facilities, maintenance, instructional support, and other operation needs. *(III.D.11-7 Final Budget 2015-2016 PPT, 9/2/15, p. 8)*

i. In June 2015, the Chancellor recommended that the Board Finance Committee (BFC) approve $3.9 million for the completion and roll-out of the District’s Student Information
System (SIS), an essential electronic system that delivers student services and supports teaching and learning and $2.5 million in critical facility infrastructure repair and maintenance at the ESC in the 2015-2016 budget. This $6.5 million investment is in line with District’s Strategic Plan and Board goals which support student success. The Board’s subsequent approval involved consideration for the District’s long-range financial priorities while balancing short- and long-term operational needs. (III.D.11-8 Deferred Maintenance Unfunded Projects 2014-2015, Attachment II & III, BFC, 6/10/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

The District adheres to well-considered reserve and fiscal management policies which are congruent with the District’s Strategic Plan, and ensure financial solvency in the short- and long-term. The proposed 2015-16 budget reflects a $65.43 million projected ending balance. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard III.D.11

III.D.11-3 – Final Budget 2015-2016, 9/2/15, pp. 1-10
III.D.11-4 – Long Range Forecast, BFC, 3/11/15
III.D.11-5 – DBC minutes, 4/22/15
III.D.11-6 – Final Budget 2015-2016 PPT, 9/2/15, p. 15
III.D.11-7 – Final Budget 2015-2016 PPT, 9/2/15, p. 8

Standard III.D.12.
The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

The District provides post-retirement healthcare benefits for eligible employees who retire through the Los Angeles Community College District Post-retirement Health Benefits Plan. This plan is a single employer OPEB plan with benefits provided based on negotiated contracts with various bargaining units of the District. As of June 30, 2104 the District has about 4,000 active full time employees who are eligible for post-retirement health benefits, and 3,200 retirees with
surviving spouses who receive post-retirement health benefits. The funding of the OPEB liability is allocated annually as part of the District resource allocation process. The District has commissioned actuarial studies on this liability every two years. The last report was undertaken on June 30, 2013.

The annual required contribution is based on projected pay as you go financing requirements. Additionally, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution on, April 23, 2008, (COM No BF2) to establish an irrevocable trust with CalPERS to prefund a portion of the retiree health benefit costs. The trust is funded with annual contributions by the District of approximately 1.92% of the full time salary expenditures in the District. For 2015-16, this amount is approximately $23.27 million.

Additionally, the District directs an amount equivalent to the federal Medicare Part D subsidy, which is returned to the District and placed into the trust fund. The District deposited $7,206,829 to the irrevocable trust with CalPERS during FY14.

**Standard III.D.12** The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.

The District takes appropriate and timely action in planning and allocating payment of liabilities and future obligations. It continuously monitors for potential increases in OPEB and other employee-related obligations and takes action accordingly.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. Budget planning includes funding of contingency reserves (3.5%), general reserves (6.5%), and a deferred maintenance reserve (1.5%). There are also special reserve set-asides for future obligations; a set aside for 2015-2016 salary increase as well as STRS and PERS contribution increases, and a set aside for new faculty hires to meet FON obligations (see Standard III.D.11).

b. The District carefully calculates payment of its short and long-term liabilities. As of June 30, 2014, the District’s total long-term liabilities were $3.8 billion. The majority of this amount was general obligation (G.O.) bonds, but it also included workers’ compensation claims, general liability, compensated absences, and capital lease obligations. (III.D.12-1 LACCD Financial Audit, p.38, June 30, 2014)

c. The District calculates debt service requirements based on maturity for its three general obligation bonds. The District has issued various G.O. bonds from the authorization of its three bonds. Each bond issuance has its own debt service payment schedule and is paid and serviced by the County of Los Angeles. (III.D.12-2 LACCD Financial Audit, p.39-44, June 30, 2014)

d. The District regularly reviews and analyzes the impact of OPEB, retirement rate increases, and affordable health care reforms. In July 2013, Aon Hewitt provided the District with an Actuarial Valuation Report for its postretirement health benefits. (III.D.12-3 Postretirement Health Benefits Actuarial Valuation, 7/1/13)

e. In February 2015, the BFC reviewed budget impacts of assumed rate increases over the next seven years for CalSTRS and CalPERS, including annual required contributions based on these assumptions, and reviewed an analysis of the Affordable Health Care program (Cadillac Tax) and its impact on CalPERS health premiums. (III.D.12-4 Future Costs Analysis, BFC meeting, 2/11/15)

f. In every year to date, the District’s employer contributions to CalSTRS, CalPERS, Cash Balance, and PARS-ARS met the required contribution rate established by law. (III.D.12-5 LACCD Financial Audit, p. 33, June 30, 2014)

g. The District has taken significant steps to address the issue of its unfunded liability for retiree healthcare. An agreement, approved by the District’s six unions and the Board of Trustees, was negotiated to begin pre-funding a portion of unfunded obligations. In 2008, the Board adopted a resolution to establish an irrevocable trust with CalPERS to pre-fund a portion of plan costs. The District funds the trust at a rate of approximately 1.92% of the total full-time salary expenditures of the District. An amount equivalent to the federal Medicare Part D subsidy returned to the District each year will also be directed into the trust fund. (III.D.12-6 Board agenda and minutes, Com. No. BF2, 4/23/2008)
h. As of June 30, 2015, the District had set aside approximately $57.3 million in an external trust fund and its fair market value for this same period was $76.8 million. The District is considering increasing its contributions to this fund, but its contributions for the 2015-2016 fiscal year remains at 1.92% of applicable salaries of FY2014-2015 at the present time. (III.D.12-7 CalPERS Quarterly Financial Statement, 6/30/15)

i. The District has allocated appropriate resources for the payment of workers’ compensation. The District is self-insured for up to a maximum of $750,000 for each workers’ compensation claim and $1 million per employment practices claim (see Standard III.D.9).

j. The balance of all outstanding workers’ compensation is estimated based on information provided by an outside actuarial study performed in 2014. The amount of the outstanding liability as of June 30, 2014 includes estimates of future claim payments for known causes as well as provisions for incurred, but not yet reported, claims and adverse development on known cases which occurred through that date (see Standard III.D.9).

k. Because the process used in computing claims liability does not necessarily result in an exact amount, liabilities for incurred losses to be settled over a long period of time are reported at their present value using an expected future investment yield assumption of 1.5%. The current portion (due within one fiscal year) of the District’s current workers’ compensation liability is $5 million (see Standard III.D.9).

l. Board Rule 101001.5 limits the accrual of employee vacation leave to no more than 400 hours, which provides a measure of control over employee-related expenses. The District also “…does not provide lump-sum payment for any unused accumulated illness, injury or quarantine allowance to an employee upon separation of service…” (III.D.12-8 BR 101001.5); (III.D.12-9 BR 101020)

Analysis and Evaluation

The District’s short-range financial decisions are well integrated with long-term financial plans for facilities and infrastructure development, technology investments, and hiring. Long-term obligations, specifically debt repayment of general obligation bonds arising from the construction program and control of insurance expenses, are effectively managed. Health benefit costs for active employees are fully funded every fiscal year. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard III.D.12

III.D.12-3 – Postretirement Health Benefits Actuarial Valuation, 7/1/13
III.D.12-4 – Future Costs Analysis, BFC meeting, 2/11/15
III.D.12-6 – Board agenda and minutes, Com. No. BF2, 4/23/2008
On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College is currently paying back a local loan (deficit) from the District from 2008-09 of approximately $2.3 million. Consistent with the District’s debt repayment policy, the college will be assessed $463,220 annually until the debt is repaid.

With the additionally deficit incurred in 2014-15, the overall debt repayment for the college will increase by $500,000 in 2016-17. This amount would equal approximately 2% of the total resources received by the college in 2014-15. As noted, the repayment of this debt is considered a “loan” from the District and subject to repayment pursuant to Board Policy. The college has no other locally issued debt instruments.

While the College would benefit from having these funds available for its current programs and services, the repayment has not resulted in any substantial adverse impact to our current operations.

Standard III.D.13 On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The District does not currently have any locally incurred debt, nor has it had any during the past thirty years.

Analysis and Evaluation

The District meets this Standard.

All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

Our auxiliary activities (i.e. bookstore and child development funds) undergo a comprehensive review of their operational budgets each year. These reviews are made by the respective department managers, and subsequently by the Vice President of Administrative Services and the college President. Fund accounting for these activities is handled by the college as well as the District accounting office to ensure compliance with district and board rules and policies. All auxiliary activities are developed and maintained in support of the mission of the college, and provide needed student support services.

The Los Angeles City College Foundation is a 501© entity which raises and manages donations in support of the mission and goals. Its financial resources are held and managed independently of the college with oversight from their Board of Directors. The foundation directors, which include the college President, Vice President of Administrative Services, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs, review Foundation operations and financials, which includes financial transactions, investment policies, and Foundation assets. The Foundation’s financial statements are also subject to an independent annual audit and the audits have consistently resulted in an unqualified opinion.

Grants are subject to internal review to ensure they are used in support of the college mission and goals. They are also reviewed to ensure that the proposed budgets are sufficient to meet the planned activities. The director of the grant area directs primary review and approval of grant applications, with subsequent management reviews by the Academic Services or Student Support Services Vice President. Final review and recommendation is done by the Vice President of Administrative Services, with final approval by the college President.

These multiple reviews ensure the integrity of the request, knowledge of any financial condition obligation; such as a general fund match required by the college, and verify that the grant is consistent with stated college goals. Finally, all grants must be approved by the Board of Trustees before they can be received by the college who also verify that the proposed project is aligned with District goals, as well as the college goals and mission.

Outside of these activities, the college does not contract for any local short or long-term debt instruments. The local debt that the College does carry is related to operational deficits from any of its programs and services, which is treated as a loan from the District. This loan is subject to repayment, pursuant to guidelines approved by the Board of Trustees, for a period of six years, which cannot exceed more than three percent of the college’s general fund revenue.
Currently, the College has outstanding debt from the 2008-09 fiscal year of approximately $2.3 million, and the college incurred a deficit of $2.4 million in 2014-15. Repayment of this debt comes from the prior year ending balance of the college, or from a reduction of its current year resources. The annual repayment amount is assessed each year, and if within the three percent guideline of the Board repayment policy, is applied at the beginning of each fiscal year.

Standard III.D.14 All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

The District has numerous rules, regulations, and standing procedures to ensure proper use of funds consistent with their intended purpose. Regulations are updated regularly, and both internal and external audits are conducted on an annual basis, allowing the institution to identify and promptly correct any deficiencies in internal controls and ensure financial resources are well managed and used with integrity and in accordance with their intended purpose.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. Board Rules 7608 and 7900 articulate the authority and responsibility of the CEO in overseeing compliance of the District’s financial management and internal control structure with existing Board policy, State and Federal laws and regulations, and generally accepted accounting practices (see Standard III.D.5).

b. District annual external audits have had unmodified opinions during the past 30 years. External audits include single audits of categorical and specially funded programs as well as all nine Associate Student Organizations (see Standard III.D.5). None of the audits have identified any misuse of financial resources and have confirmed that audited funds were used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding (see Standard III.D.5). (III.D.14-1 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14, pp. 82-84); (III.D.14-2 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/13, pp. 86-88); (III.D.14-3 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/12, pp. 74-78, 80-81, 84-89); (III.D.14-4 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/11, pp. 72, 78, 81-90); (III.D.14-5 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/10, pp. 70, 73, 76-83); (III.D.14-6 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/09, pp. 78, 81, 84-92)

c. The District conducts internal audits throughout the year in order to identify any weaknesses and potential misuse of financial resources. Corrective Action Plans are promptly developed and implemented for any findings or areas of concern (see Standard III.D.5).

d. Administrative Regulations governing auxiliary organizations’ management of funds, audits, grants, insurance, etc. are detailed in AO-9 through AO-19. Administrative Regulations governing Associated Student Organization funds, accounts, and expenditures are detailed in S-1 through S-7 (see Standard III.D.10). The District’s “Business Office & Accounting
Policies and Procedures Manual is widely disseminated and followed throughout the District to ensure all financial resources are used with integrity and for their intended purposes (see Standard III.D.8). (III.D.14-7 Administrative Regulations AO-9 to AO-19; III.D.14-8 Administrative Regulations S-1 to S-7); (III.D.14-9 Business Office & Accounting Policies and Procedures Manual, updated 2/21/12)

e. The Board reviews and approves issuance of additional general obligation bond funds. The District’s annual external audits for its Bond Program demonstrate that bond expenditures have been used with integrity and for their intended purposes (see Standard III.D.8). (III.D.14-10 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/14, pp. 8-9); (III.D.14-11 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/13, pp. 8); (III.D.14-12 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/12, pp. 8-10); (III.D.14-13 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/11, pp. 8-13)

f. Student loan default rates, revenues and related matters are consistently monitored to ensure compliance with federal regulations. The Central Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) ensures the segregation of duties in a manner consistent with the requirements of Title IV: student eligibility is determined at the college level; fund management is handled by District Financial Aid Accounting; disbursements are made by District Accounts Payable; disbursement record reporting is performed by the CFAU; and reconciliation is performed jointly by the college, CFAU and District Accounting. Individual colleges receive ad hoc program reviews by federal and state agencies. Any findings related to standardized procedures are resolved with the assistance of the CFAU, who then ensures all colleges are also in compliance.

g. The District has not issued any Certificates of Participation since December 2009.

Analysis and Evaluation

Internal and external audits help confirm that the District uses its financial resources with integrity and for their intended uses. The District has not received any modified audit opinions for its financial statements for over twenty years, and has received unqualified opinions for bond performance and financial audits since the inception of its bond program. The District has a strong internal control system and set of policies and procedures that help ensure its financial resources are used with integrity and for their intended purposes. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard III.D.14

III.D.14-1 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14, pp. 82-84
III.D.14-2 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/13, pp. 86-88
III.D.14-3 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/12, pp. 74-78, 80-81, 84-89
III.D.14-4 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/11, pp. 72, 78, 81-90
III.D.14-5 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/10, pp. 70, 73, 76-83
III.D.14-6 – LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/09, pp. 78, 81, 84-92
III.D.14-7 – Administrative Regulations AO-9 to AO-19
Standard III.D.15.
The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements, including Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government identifies deficiencies.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions

Analysis and Evaluation:

The student loan default rates at the college have traditionally been well below the federal guidelines default rate of thirty percent, for a two-year cohort, as defined by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. The College default rates per the latest ACCJC annual financial report were 22.6% for fiscal year 2011, 24.7% for fiscal year 2010 and 19.5% for fiscal year 2009. These rates however, do not exceed the federal guideline, and in the event that the default rate exceeds this guideline, the college has a plan in place to reduce the default rate.

To ensure that the College does not exceed the federal default rate, the college has taken proactive measures to contain and reduce the default rate by educating borrowers with information in Loan Packets, they request that borrowers complete yearly entrance and exit counseling; this exceeds federal requirements, they require borrowers to complete a money management session, and they require additional references on loan applications. The financial aid department also monitors and assesses student loan default rates regularly. Maintaining a student loan default rate well below the federal guidelines along with the unqualified audit opinions of the College, reflect effective monitoring and management practices for our student loans.

Standard III.D.16.
Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of its programs, services, and operations.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Anil to do this, based on all the leading questions in the Guide to Evaluating Institutions
Analysis and Evaluation:

The College provides effective control over all contractual agreements. Board policy and administrative regulations specify the delegation of authority and responsibilities and identify individuals charged with specific responsibilities. The Administrative Services unit, under the direction of the Vice President of Administrative Services, has the primary responsibility for the management and control of fiscal resources, including the execution of contract and grant agreements. The Administrative Services unit works closely with all areas of the College to ensure that all departments and programs, including auxiliary/grant programs and the LACC Foundation, adhere to all District policy and procedures, and the appropriate federal and state compliance guidelines.

The College follows district procedures, board policies and administrative regulations regarding all contracts. All contracts are reviewed by College management, the regional procurement specialist and the District Contracts office prior to the approval from the Board of Trustees. Contractual agreements provide the College with services to support its mission and goals, including construction, consultant, and personal services contracts, along with lease purchase agreements.

The District ensures that all contracts and agreements are reviewed by their purchasing and contracts staff to ensure necessary components are included and district standards and policies are maintained. For example the District requires all contracts to contain indemnification, termination and hold-harmless clauses as well as requiring minimum insurance levels for insurance in order to protect the interests of the District. Contract templates are utilized for various types of contracts that have been developed in conjunction with legal counsel. Added control to maintain integrity in district contracts is provided by the fact that few individuals at the College are authorized to sign contracts and those who are valid signatories for contracts have received training in contract administration and management.

All reports on financial aid, auxiliary services and grants, externally funded programs, and contractual relationships, including the creation of budgets and the issuance of purchase orders and payments to contractors and vendors, are ultimately reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees. In addition, College procedures require that no invoice is paid without an approved contract or purchase order, or sign up from departments and programs regarding the goods or services that are being delivered. By following this process it helps to ensure a strong internal control to all fiscal transactions and management of resources.

In addition to the various contracts and agreements that the college has for non-instructional services, the College has one external agreement to provide assistance and placement for students in our nursing program. This agreement is in compliance with state nursing regulations, as well as the mission and goals of the College. This contract, as with all college contracts, can be terminated if the required educational standards and requirements of the agreement are not met. All instructional contracts and grants go through a thorough review from the instructional division (Department Chair, Dean, and Vice President of Academic Affairs), with final review from the Vice President of Administrative Services and/or the college President.
Standard IV
Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

Standard IV.A.1.
Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Creation, encouragement, and support of innovation

- The primary mechanism for improving practices, programs, and services at the unit level is through program review (link to comprehensive and annual program reviews SharePoint page)
- The primary mechanism for improving practices, programs, and services at the College level is through the participatory governance structure, including changes to policy, process, handbooks, and operating agreements (committee annual assessments)
- Committee leadership is evaluated annually by the committee (committee annual assessments)
- Broad representation on committees allows stakeholders from all areas to bring ideas for change to the committee (evidence: org chart in the Handbook)
- The College holds regular open forums to encourage innovation (link to agendas for Days of Dialogue, Senate Summits, Opening Flex Day, Faculty Symposium, Classified Symposium, Accreditation Kickoff, Student Success forum)
- Numerous committees hold annual retreats or workshops to encourage team building and innovation: Department Chair Council workshop, Academic Senate retreat, others? (link to agendas from each)

Stakeholder initiative to improve practices, programs, and services
• All stakeholders can bring forward a proposal to change a campus process individually or through a representative on participatory governance committees (evidence: operating agreement committee membership)

• Campus stakeholders have numerous ways to make their voices heard:
  o All campus stakeholders are represented in college participatory governance committees (link to Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook)
  o Faculty participate in department meetings and District discipline meetings
  o All faculty can express their interest to serve on Senate committees (link to committee interest form)
  o Administrators participate in senior staff, deans, and IDWG meetings
  o Students participate through the Associated Student Government

• Students, faculty, and staff participate by completing surveys that are used by participatory governance committees to improve processes (link to student survey: (link to campus climate and admin services surveys)

• The following committees have membership that includes faculty, staff, administration, and students: College Council, Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), Bond Steering (retired), Enrollment Management Team (EMT), Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee (EPPIC), Program Review and Effectiveness Subcommittee (PRE), Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLO&A), Technology Steering, Committee on Pathways for Access and Student Success (COMPASS), Facilities Planning (which now includes the functions of the former Bond Steering Committee, Distance Education (operating agreements)

• All campus members have the opportunity to effect improvement by engaging in program review, which is required of all units (Online Annual Program Review Process)

Systematic participative processes

• The Collegial Consultation Agreement between the College President and the Academic Senate, and approved by the Governing Board, establishes the manner in which policy and procedure recommendations on academic and professional matters under the purview of the Academic Senate brought forward from the Academic Senate to the College President (Fall 2012 Collegial consultation agreement)

• No change to standing policy is enforced unless the change is approved through the participatory governance process. All recommendations for changes to policies with institution-wide implications go through either the College Council or the Academic Senate (link: committee reporting structure in the Integrated Planning Handbook)

• The College Council includes 8 faculty, 5 administrators, 4 classified staff, and 2 students as voting members plus additional non-voting resource members, such as the SLO Coordinator and Staff and Organizational Development Coordinator, who bring their particular expertise to the discussions and deliberations of the College Council.(link: College Council operating agreement)

• All recommendations made in College Council and Academic Senate are posted on committee websites (link to College Council and Academic Senate recommendation folders)

• The College has a clearly defined process for discussing, approving, and implementing recommendations in the College Council (College Council Handbook; to be updated)
• The College has a clearly defined process for discussing, approving, and implementing recommendations in the Academic Senate (Academic Senate Handbook; to be drafted).
• Meeting minutes include the names of all participants, including guests (link to minutes template).
• The College documents the participants in the annual program review process (link to where participants are listed on APR unit reports and unit planning objectives).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College mission and Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) goals articulate the College’s commitment to student success and educational excellence. The LACC mission is to “empower students from the diverse communities it serves to achieve their educational and career goals by providing learner-centered pathways to success through transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills programs.” Goals 1 and 2 of the ESMP speak directly to student access and success and Goals 3 and 4 provide support for those goals of student success (2014-20 ESMP). In operating agreements (“Plan linkages”) committees articulate how they support the mission and whether they are charged with oversight over ESMP objectives (link to sample agreement). Through program review, units create planning objectives that align with ESMP objectives and measures (link to online unit planning objectives). The College does not have a separate values statement, but the mission and ESMP goals embody the values of the College.

Goals and values are articulated and understood by College constituencies. An overwhelming majority of faculty and staff (2014: 81%, 2015: 82%) are familiar with the mission statement (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015). A majority understands the participatory governance process (2014: 58%; 2015: 60%) and agrees that the campus shared governance process allows all campus personnel to participate in decision-making (2014: 46%; 2015: 44%) (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015). Although most students do not know how to bring forth an idea to college leadership to improve a practice, program, or service at LACC (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #30b), a majority agree that student needs are taken into consideration when making decisions (LACCD Student Survey Results 2015, #30c).

The participatory governance structure ensures that all College constituencies are represented. (See Standard IV.A.2 chart indicating constituency membership on governance committees.) All individuals at the campus have the opportunity to provide innovative ideas that can lead to institutional improvement. Individuals can present their ideas to their immediate supervisor, who in turn can take the idea to their supervisor. Recommendations can be made directly at open committee meetings or through constituency representatives.

Improvement of practice, programs, and services at the College level occurs through the hierarchy of the participatory governance process. All units have representatives on governance committees (Committee reporting structure in the Integrated Planning Handbook). Any proposed revisions to the college planning and budget development process are reviewed through the college participatory governance structure, which gives all stakeholders the opportunity for review and input. As with the program review process, all proposed revisions to the college
planning and budget development processes are made by mutual agreement between the College President and the Academic Senate. (See Committee Planning and Decision-Making Flowchart in Standard I.B.8.)

Improvement of practice, programs, and services at the unit level occurs through the program review process, which includes a review of SLO assessments and disaggregated, longitudinal data to generate dialogue and unit planning objectives for improvement (link to data sets for 2012 CPR and 2013, 2014, 2015 annual updates). Discussions for improvement take place at unit meetings and informally between colleagues. The entire unit has the opportunity to participate in the program review process (link to online Annual Program Review process) and all results are posted online (link to SharePoint program review results; EPPIC Program Review Summary). Stakeholders may identify potential areas for improvement to the program review process and bring those forward for discussion in participatory governance committees for review and input by all college stakeholders. Ultimately all revisions to the program review processes are made by mutual agreement between the College President and the Academic Senate per the LACC Collegial Consultation Agreement (link to agreement).

The outcomes of College and program review are available to the public online, with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness charged with creating and posting data and supporting documentation. An online link to the Scorecard provides information on momentum points and completion in remedial English/ESL/Math; persistence; students who completed over 30 units; and degree, certificate, and transfer rates (link to online link). Online College profiles provide information completion, access, and financial aid (link to 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 College Profiles). Data sets used to assess the ESMP are online (ESMP data sets 2014-15), as are the results of ESMP assessments (link to ESMP Committee Oversight page) and committee assessments (provide sample Annual Assessment). Learning outcomes information is posted online (SLO&A Annual Summary Reports), as are the results of faculty hiring (link) and resource request prioritizations (link). Institutional performance data is disseminated to the campus in other forums, including open sessions on the six-year revision of the mission and ESMP, Faculty Symposium, Days of Dialogue, and on-campus professional development sessions. All reports and presentations are stored on the website and as such are made available to all College constituencies.

The College uses the participatory governance structure to implement policy changes that have significant institution-wide implications. For example, the 2013 redesign of the governance structure included presentations at all major campus committees, and ultimately the process was approved at the Academic Senate and College Council (link to New Model for Governance; link to minutes). Similarly, all major participatory governance committees contributed to the 2013-14 revision of the mission statement (ST1A.13 LACC College Council Recommendation #90) and the ESMP (College Council Recommendation #109). The Integrated Planning Handbook was vetted at all major college committees, including the College Council, and approved by mutual agreement between the Academic Senate and College President (link to minutes, academic senate resolutions). The Guide to Distance Education, including distance education policies, went through the participatory governance process and was approved by the College President on the recommendation of the Academic Senate (link). Through the governance process, all
constituencies had the opportunity to engage in the writing of ESMP supporting plans including the Staff and Organizational Development Plan (see p.X), Distance Education Plan (see p.X), Human Resources Plan (see p.X), and Technology Resources plan (see p.X).

**Action Plan.** By spring 2016 the College will create a single webpage (combining Office of Research and Office of Institutional Effectiveness information) with links to all institutional performance data, including historical data.

**Standard IV.A.2.**
The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

**Policies and procedures that describe constituency roles in governance**
- The College’s policy on administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making regarding institutional policies and procedures is described in the Integrated Planning Handbook. The handbook describes the roles for each group in governance, including planning and budget development. An agreed upon policy ensures that “all campus constituencies (administration, classified staff, faculty, and students) work collaboratively and collegially.” The policy defines how recommendations for change are made. *(Integrated Planning Handbook, p.8)*
- The Board of Trustees recognizes the role of the Academic Senate *(Link: LACCD Board Rules, Chapter XVIII, Article 1)*
- All full-time faculty members are required to serve on at least one committee or equivalent *(Link: LACCD & AFT Agreement, Article 32.II)*
- Each operating agreement for each committee establishes membership and decision-making processes *(link to the operating agreement template)*
- Documents that describe the official responsibilities and authority of faculty and academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters:
  - Collegial Consultation Agreement 2012 *(link)*
  - Administrative Regulations E-64 (program approval) and E-65 (course approval) *(link to both)*
  - Board Rule 6100-6103 (Chapter VI, Article I) *(link)*
  - Board Rule (Chapter XVIII, Article I) recognizes the role of Academic Senates
  - Integrated Planning Handbook *(see specific pages that articulate membership and responsibilities)*
  - A New Model for Governance
  - Distance Education Handbook *(link)*
- Documents that describe the role of students
  - The Board of Trustees recognizes the role of students *(Link: LACCD Board Rules, Chapter XVIII, Article 2)*
○ Students are represented through the Associated Student Government, which has membership on major shared governance committees including College Council, Strategic Planning Committee, Bond Steering, Educational Policies and Program Integrity (link to operating agreements).

Analysis and Evaluation:

Based on committee operating agreements, participatory governance committees have faculty, staff, student, and administration representatives in a voting or liaison capacity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Organizational Development</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Steering Committee</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Team</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning Committee</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Committee</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Team</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee (EPPIC)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review and Effectiveness</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO and Assessment</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Resource Allocation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Hiring Prioritization</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Also see the Committee Planning and Decision-Making Flowchart in Standard I.B.8)

The LACC Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook describes the College’s participatory governance and decision-making processes and how individuals bring forward ideas and how stakeholders work together to make recommendations to improve the college (link). Each committee has an operating agreement that defines its role and responsibilities, outlines its operational structure, and describes how the committee assesses its work towards continuous quality improvement of the institution (link). Operating agreements are posted online and updated periodically as identified in the agreement itself, with any changes approved by the College Council or Academic Senate Executive Committee as appropriate.

The participatory governance structure is designed so that institutional plans, policies, and other key considerations are acted upon in a timely manner, with final recommendations on policy changes forwarded to the College President by either the College Council or Academic Senate,
as appropriate. The effectiveness of functioning of policies and procedures can be seen in agendas and minutes that demonstrate regularity of meetings, actions taken, and discussions; annual committee assessments (see the report of assessments completed each year in Standard IV.A.5); and number of recommendations that are submitted to the College president.

The College Council submits formal written recommendations on resource allocation, operational decision-making, and institution-wide quality assurance and process improvement to the College President. If the recommendation is accepted, the College President signs and returns the form to the College Council co-chairs, who report the final status of the recommendations at the next appropriate College Council meeting. If the recommendation is rejected, the President provides a written response to the College Council. The outcome is noted in the minutes and the recommendation is posted online by the College Council co-chairs (Link to CC recommendations). Over the past three fiscal years the President has considered X College Council recommendations (link to Senate resolutions by year).

The Board of Trustees recognizes the Academic Senate’s role as the legal representative of the faculty in making recommendations with respect to policies and processes that are academic and professional matters to the College President (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter XVIII, Article 1). The College President can approve, approve with modifications, or reject a recommendation. If modified or rejected, the President provides a written explanation to the Academic Senate per the requirements of Title 5 §53203 of the California Code of Regulations. The Academic Senate President posts online the signed recommendation, and the final dispositions of recommendations are noted in minutes (Link to signed resolutions). Over the past three fiscal years the President has considered an average of 28 Senate resolutions and has approved all of them? (link to Senate resolutions by year).

The Board of Trustees recognizes the role that students have in participating effectively in the formulation and development of college policies and procedures that have a significant effect on students (LACCD Board Rules, Chapter XVIII, Article 2). The College supports the participation of students by ensuring a student representative exists on all primary participatory governance committees.

**Standard IV.A.3.**
Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, 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.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

**Roles of administrators and faculty in governance**
- The committee with primary oversight of institutional policies, planning, and budget is the College Council (link to operating agreement)
- Other committees that deal with institutional policies, planning, and budget are the Strategic Planning Committee, Budget Committee, and Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee (link to operating agreements)
• The campus has clearly defined roles for faculty and administrators in policy making, planning, and budget (Integrated Planning Handbook, pages on participatory governance)
• The College President and Academic Senate established a Collegial Consultation Agreement that delineates the collegial consultation process and identifies which of the academic and professional matters the College President is to rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate and which academic and professional matters the College President is to reach mutual agreement with the Academic Senate (Fall 2012 Collegial consultation agreement)
• The faculty through the Academic Senate have primacy in terms of academic and professional matters (California Education Code §70902(b)(7); California Code of Regulations Title 5, §53200; LACCD Board Rules Chapter XVIII, Article 1)

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College has clearly defined decision-making roles for faculty and administrators in budget prioritization, faculty hiring, strategic planning, and program review (Integrated Planning Handbook pages on participatory governance). Each participatory governance committee of the College Council and the Academic Senate has an approved operating agreement that defines the committee’s purpose and responsibilities, its membership based on stakeholder representation, and its operational procedures (link to operating agreements for all major College committees).

Faculty and administration make up the majority of governance committees, allowing them to bring their various perspectives that represent their constituencies. The College Council has four administrators and eight faculty, constituting 67 percent of the total membership. The Strategic Planning Committee has 11 faculty, 6 administration, 89 percent of total; the Budget Committee has 9 faculty, 8 administration, 94 percent of total; and the Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee has 15 faculty, 5 administration, 91 percent of total.

Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Policies and procedures
• The college Curriculum Committee operates under the auspices of the college Academic Senate and has primary responsibility for making curriculum recommendations (Curriculum Committee Operating Agreement)
• New curriculum needs are identified and validated through program review, and a formal process exists for approving new courses (link to Curriculum Handbook or to ECD, E-65)
• New student learning programs needs are identified and validated through program review, and a formal process exists for approving new degree and certificate programs (link to PNPR, E-64)
The roles of administrators and faculty in curriculum are delineated in the Collegial Consultation Agreement 2012 (link).

The Integrated Planning Handbook articulates faculty and academic administrator roles in governance committees including curriculum and student learning programs and services (see specific pages that articulate membership and responsibilities).

Analysis and Evaluation:

Board Rules state that courses and programs shall be approved by the Board of Trustees (Board Rules, Chapter VI, Article I, 6101), with faculty having primacy in terms of academic and professional matters (California Education Code §70902(b)(7); California Code of Regulations Title 5, §53200; LACCD Board Rules Chapter XVIII, Article 1). At the District level, the District Curriculum Committee, which operates under the auspices of the District Academic Senate (DAS), has primary responsibility for making recommendations in the area of curriculum development, including maintaining oversight of the curriculum approval process; ensuring compliance with statutory and regulatory changes; making curriculum development and academic standards policy recommendations; and ensuring faculty, staff, and students participate in curricular discussions. The District Academic Senate oversee the functions of the various district-wide discipline committees and ensures that faculty representatives of disciplines from each college meet to discuss general issues, concerns, and changes related to their disciplines and make district-level recommendations affecting the disciplines in the areas of curriculum and faculty qualifications to the District Academic Senate (link to District Handbook).

At the College level, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee is responsible for the approval of all new programs and courses, and revisions to all programs and courses. All courses are reviewed and updated at least every six years, and all updates and revisions to the courses are approved by the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee also reviews and approves requests to offer courses as honors courses and through distance education, and it approves all new and revised course and program SLOs for all courses and degree and certificate programs. The Curriculum Committee also approves requests to delete or archive courses that are no longer needed. The Curriculum Committee is composed of one representative from each academic department and is chaired by the Vice President of the Academic Senate (Curriculum Chair). The Curriculum Committee maintains a Technical Review Committee that reviews all proposals for new courses and programs, and all course updates, for compliance with legal requirements and local curricular standards (Curriculum Committee Operating Agreement, E-64, E-65, E-89?(for DE approval)). The Distance Education Handbook describes the process for approving DE curriculum and describes supporting programs and services (link to DE Handbook).

The College follows the district process for approving new courses, as described in the district administrative regulation E-65. [April Pavlik to work on this; part of Curriculum Handbook?; link to E-65.] All proposals for new courses are first reviewed by the discipline faculty before they are submitted for technical review. Once the discipline faculty agree to the new course proposal, it is submitted to the Curriculum Chair who then reviews the course and either forwards it to the Technical Review Committee for its review or returns it to the discipline faculty for further work. Upon completion of the fourteen-day(?) technical review period the
Curriculum Chair reviews the results of technical review returns it to the discipline faculty to address required corrections identified by the Technical Review Committee as needed. Once a new course has completed the technical review process, the Curriculum Chair brings the new course to the Curriculum Committee for review and approval. Following Curriculum Committee approval, the new course is then forwarded to the Academic Senate for approval. Following all college-level approvals, the new course is then submitted to the district Vice Chancellor for Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness for review and submission to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The College follows the district process for approving new degree and certificate programs, as described in the district administrative regulation E-64. Local approval begins with the Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee to ensure that the proposed new program meets needs identified and validated through program review. After initial approval by EPPIC, the department completes the State Chancellor’s Office form CCC-501: Application for New Credit Program (April Pavlik to work on this—Curriculum handbook?). The new program proposal is then submitted to the Curriculum Committee for review and approval, and then to the Academic Senate for approval. All new degree and certificate programs approved by the Academic Senate are reviewed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and then reviewed and approved by the College President. Following approval by the College President, all new programs are then submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness for review and submission to the Board of Trustees for approval. (link to E-64)

Student learning programs are assessed and improved through the established program review process, which includes assessment of program and course student learning outcomes, and includes validation by academic deans. Recommendations for student learning programs may include a viability study, the process for which is well defined (link to 1997 Viability Review Process). The results of the comprehensive and annual program reviews, including recommendations for improvement, are reviewed by the appropriate Vice President and then reviewed and approved by EPPIC as recommendations to the Academic Senate. Following review and approval by the Academic Senate, the recommendations from all program reviews are forwarded to the College President for review and approval. Upon approval by the president all recommendations for program improvement are official recommendations that must be addressed by programs and documented in subsequent program reviews (link to operating agreements, EPPIC summary of program review results, senate resolution).

The effectiveness of functioning of policies and procedures that ensure faculty and academic administrators have the responsibility for making recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services can be seen in agendas and minutes that demonstrate regularity of meetings, actions taken, and discussions; annual committee assessments; and the number of recommendations that are submitted to the College president (examples?).

Distance Education. In April 2013, the College submitted a report to the ACCJC concerning “The Addition of Courses Constituting Fifty Percent or More of the Units in a Program Offered through a Mode of Distance or Electronic Delivery.” The ACCJC commended the College on the “completeness and clarity of the proposal” (ACCJC Response to DE Sub Change Report).
Through its curriculum review process, the College tracks if any programs surpass 50 percent of courses delivered through DE.

**Standard IV.A.5.**
Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

**Written policies ensuring relevant perspectives**
- The College has a written policy on governance procedures that specify roles and ensures that “all campus constituencies (administration, classified staff, faculty, and students) work collaboratively and collegially” in the participatory governance process. The College has a clear planning and decision-making process. ([Integrated Planning Handbook, p.8](#))
- Each operating agreement for each participatory governance committee establishes the committee’s purpose, membership and decision-making processes ([link to the operating agreement template](#))
  - The operating agreements that describe the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning include: Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, SLO&A, DE Committee, EPPIC

**Handbooks and manuals outlining roles for constituencies and ensuring institutional consistency**
- Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook; 2014; revised 2015
  - Shared Governance Handbook, 2009
  - Program Review Handbook, 2009
- Curriculum Handbook, 2015 ([coming soon](#))
- Institutional Integrity Manual, 2015
- Distance Education Handbook, 2014
- Department Chairs Handbook, 2013
- Committee Chairs Handbook, 2013; revised 2015
- SLO Handbooks, 2012, revised 2015
- SLO Course Coordinator Roles and Responsibilities, 2015
- SLO Department Coordinator Roles and Responsibilities, 2015
- Faculty Handbook, 20XX (revised annually)
- Outreach Training Manual, 2015, used for training for student ambassadors, career guidance counseling assistants, classified staff, and faculty

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
The participatory governance structure is designed so that all constituencies have input and participation in College decision-making processes, and that institutional plans, policies, and other key considerations are acted upon in a timely manner. (See Committee Planning and Decision-Making Flowchart in Standard I.B.8.) All participatory governance committees have approved operating agreements and consistent annual assessments that are posted online. Operating agreements allow committee membership from all constituencies to know essential information about how committees contribute to achieving ESMP goals, improving learning, and helping the College meet its mission (see “Decision Making/Recommendations” and “Plan Linkages” in operating agreements).

The College Council makes recommendations on resource allocation, operational decision-making, and institution-wide quality assurance and process improvement to the President. Such recommendations are developed through collegial discussion in committees and task forces under the purview of the College Council in accordance with their purposes and specific charges. These bodies are representative bodies of college constituencies and include faculty, staff, students and administrators. Once a proposal is developed, discussed and approved by a committee it is forwarded to the College Council for review and action. Recommendations approved by the College Council are submitted to the college President in writing for a final decision. If the recommendation is accepted, the President signs and returns the form at the next meeting. If the recommendation is rejected, the President provides a written response at the next meeting. The outcome is noted in the minutes and the recommendation is posted online by the College Council co-chairs. The operating agreement for the College Council outlines the expectations for members, including developing a college wide perspective, active and regular participation, communicating with constituencies, and observing standards of ethical conduct (see “Expectations for members of College Council” in the operating agreement).

The Academic Senate engages in discussions and provides recommendations to the president on academic and professional matters. Staff, students, and administrators are all represented appropriately on senate committees, in accordance with all applicable collective bargaining agreements, Board Rules, regulations, and statutes (evidence: operating agreements, list of applicable board rules, regulations, statutes and article 32 of the AFT 1521 CBA). Such recommendations are developed through collegial discussions in committees and task forces under the purview of the Academic Senate in accordance with their purposes and specific charges. Once a proposal is developed, discussed and approved by a committee it is forwarded to the Academic Senate for review and action. Recommendations approved by the Academic Senate are forwarded to the college President in writing for a final decision. The Academic Senate submits formal written recommendations on academic and professional matters to the College president. The College president may approve, approve with modifications, or reject a recommendation. If modified or rejected, the President provides a written explanation to the Academic Senate per the requirements of Title 5 sec. 53203 and the LACC Collegial Consultation Agreement (evidence: text of 53203, link to Collegial Consultation Agreement). The outcome is noted in the minutes and the recommendation is posted online by the Academic Senate. At the start of each fiscal year, a presentation is made that outlines the roles and responsibilities for academic senators (link to John’s document presented on Sept 3).
Annual assessments of each participatory governance committee document the participation of all members and list the number of guests. Evidence that the efforts of the College Council and Academic Senate have resulted in College improvement include the governance restructuring, adoption of the formal integrated planning process, faculty prioritization process (used for the last three years), and ongoing use of planning processes to develop resource prioritization. In addition, the College has adopted numerous (April Pavlik to find #) ADTs through its curriculum process and has approved 14 ADTs that will provide additional opportunities for students to transfer to CSUs. The College has also streamlined the curriculum technical review process so that courses can be approved in a timely manner; a process that used to take months now takes 14 days.

In addition to the formal participatory governance reporting structure, regular communications to the College occur through City Chatter, President’s Newsletter, press releases from the District, press releases from the President’s office, Vice President’s Newsletters, My LACC Story, The Collegian, and open forums such as the Days of Dialogue, Faculty Symposium, and Staff Symposium.

College employees are aware of College efforts to achieve goals and improve learning, including institutional priorities (2014: 50%; 2015: 60%), student learning/service outcomes (2014: 79%; 2015: 81%), program review process (2014: 62%; 2015: 67%), and the learning outcomes for each of the courses they teach (2014: 85%; 2015: 83%). An increasing percentage of employees is familiar with the campus-wide planning process and how it drives LACC’s budgeting of resources (2014: 42%; 2015: 51%). (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015.)

**Standard IV.A.6.**
The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

**Documentation of processes for decision-making**
- Processes for decision-making are articulated in the Integrated Planning Handbook (link)
- Committee operating agreements describe how the committee makes decisions and recommendations (link to “Decision Making/Recommendations” section in a sample operating agreement)

**Communication of decisions**
- Committee decisions are documented in minutes that are approved at the subsequent meeting and then posted online (link to main page?)
- Recommendations and committee outcomes are documented in committee annual assessments, which are approved by committee and posted online (link to annual assessment template)
- All committee documents are stored on the College Website and are accessible to the public (link to the Committee Chair handbook page that states that they are required to post all documents online)
Analysis and Evaluation:

The Integrated Planning Handbook describes how ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning allows the College to refine its key processes; how the structure and processes allow the College to support, assess, and improve student learning; explains how resources are allocated to support student learning; and guides the College in using data to support dialogue about processes and the improvement of institutional effectiveness (link to Handbook). Part of educating the campus about the processes described in the handbook included breakout sessions at Faculty Symposium (link to PowerPoint), and governance committees were asked to review the process maps.

The participatory governance committee structure supports the dissemination of information across the College. The college President and vice presidents provide reports to the College Council, including newly approved policies and procedures, directives, and decisions made that affect the campus. These are reflected in the minutes and archived at the College Council website (link).

The College Council and Academic Senate have as a standing item on their agendas the status of previous recommendations, which are shared with the committee and formally documented in committee minutes. Committee chairs are trained on how to disseminate information to the College (link to Committee Chair Handbook).

**Standard IV.A.7.**
*Leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

**Evaluation of governance and decision-making structure**
- As part of annual assessment, all campus governance committees document all changes that were made to policies, procedures, and processes (link to annual assessment template).

**How communicated**
- Committee annual assessments are approved and posted online
- Committee handbooks and plans indicate when they are to be updated and assessed (provide some examples). Any changes are approved through the governance process, documented in minutes, and posted online at the committee website.
- The committee chair is responsible for posting committee outcomes (link to Committee Chair Handbook)

Analysis and Evaluation:
All governance committees under the College Council and the Academic Senate are required to compile annual committee assessments that document that committee guidelines were followed, agendas distributed, and minutes posted, that list all committee action items, identify areas for improvement for the committee and identify committee goals for the next academic year. Annual assessments are completed within the committee, so members share results with constituencies. Following completion and approval by the committees, the assessments are reviewed and approved by the College Council or Academic Senate as appropriate and posted online at the committee website ([link to annual assessment template]). The annual assessment template itself was expanded in spring 2015 to make the documentation of committee evaluation more comprehensive ([link to minutes where new template was approved]).

All College planning and governance processes are documented in The Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook and are evaluated by the Strategic Planning Committee at least every three years to assure their integrity and effectiveness. Any recommended changes are subject to approval by the Academic Senate through mutual agreement with the President (Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook “Approval and Revision”).

Some examples of improvements made as a result of a review of governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes include:

- [Barbara Macz to take a look at annual assessments from a few key committees from the last 1-2 years—list the “improvements made to process”]

- College Council 2014-15:
  - Find annual assessments?

- EPPIC 2014-15:
  - September 2014:
    - Clarified committee membership.
    - Altered Viability process to clarify language
  - October 2014:
    - Approved new forms from PRE

- Strategic Planning Committee:
  - 2014-15:
    - Added ESMP accountability measures to Operating Agreement
  - 2013-14:
    - Created new structure called Strategic Planning Committee
    - 2013-14 SPC Operating Agreement
    - Recommended new LACC Mission statement
    - Developed new integrated Strategic and Educational Master Plan
    - Reviewed creating of Integrated Strategic Planning Handbook
    - Created COMPASS and SSSP as subcommittees of SPC

- Creation of an online system for committees to track action plans and measures towards ESMP objectives ([link to interface]).
• Creation of an online system for units to track action plans and measures developed through program review (link to interface).
• A review of the budget process assessment resulted in significant revisions to the budget development and resource allocation processes that were approved in June 2014 and further reviewed, revised and approved in June 2015.
• Standardized the template for committee operating agreements, including review of all operating agreements to clarify roles and responsibilities and bringing committee memberships in line with collective bargaining agreements.
• Standardized the template for committee annual assessments.
• Expanded use of SharePoint to document outcomes, including operating agreements that specify committee membership and processes and annual assessments that track committee member participation.
• Increased participation in program review among operational units (show increase in # of programs that participated in program review over the years).
• Increase in unit planning objectives (205 in 2013-14, 273 in 2014-15; add 2015-16 #s once available).
• Increase in unit planning objectives completed (0% in 2013-14 to 10% in 2014-15) and in progress (21% in 2013-14 to 38% in 2014-15) (link to EPPIC APR Summary 2014-15 and the 2015-16 to be written).
• Major review and restructuring of College processes and policies occurred during 2013-2015 and included the restructuring of College governance structures, which culminated in the approval of The New Model for Governance in spring 2013, and the completion and approval of the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook in spring 2015. The New Model for Governance clarified committee responsibilities and reporting, more clearly aligned student success efforts with institutional planning, and helped ensure that faculty, staff, students, and administrators increased engagement and worked cooperatively to make recommendation on policies and processes towards student success. (A New Model for Governance)
• To address concerns with attendance, the Academic Senate wrote an attendance bylaw requiring replacement of members who miss meetings. Members appointed by the Academic Senate who miss more than 25% of the regularly scheduled meetings are replaced by the Academic Senate President (Senate Bylaws, Article I, section 12, clause 3).
• The Academic Senate revised its bylaws to give the Academic Senate Executive Committee authority over committee operations, including the final approval of Academic Senate committee operating agreements.
• Through regular consultation, faculty leadership and senior staff members collaborate on ways to utilize the governance structure to resolve areas of weakness. Significant outcomes include the Hiring Prioritization Process and Classified Prioritization Process.
• Hendricks, Freitas, Dekermenjian to write up summary of why we merged Bond Steering and Facilities Planning Committee.
• Also see Section XI. Changes and Plans Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process.
**Action Plan.** Starting in spring 2016, the College Council and Academic Senate will create an end of year document that describes all recommendations passed and how those recommendations resulted in improved College operations. The document will include a summary of subcommittee annual assessments and provide a clear way to communicate how the College evaluates its governance and decision-making structures.

**Quality Focus Essay Plan.** 1.2.2 Develop an enrollment management taskforce to develop and monitor recruitment. *As a result of our evaluation, we recognized the need to create this taskforce.*

Objective 1.4.3 Consider the long-term relationship and reporting structure of the new enrollment management task force and the Enrollment Management Team. *As a result of our evaluation, we recognized the need to create this taskforce*

[Wanner to write this]

**Standard IV.B. Chief Executive Officer**

**Standard IV.B.1.**
The institutional chief executive officer (CEO) has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The CEO provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The College governance structure is designed so that the President (CEO) approves all College Council and Academic Senate resolutions (*Integrated Planning Handbook, pp.9-10*)
- The College President oversees academic affairs, student services, and administrative services (*link to org chart*)
- The President and Academic Senate have a Collegial Consultation Agreement delineating responsibility for academic and professional matters (*link*)
- The President approves all formal recommendations from the College Council and Academic Senate
- The President approves the college budget (*link to process in the District procurement handbook*)
- In selecting personnel, the President adheres to all contracts
- The President oversees College professional development
- The President oversees institutional effectiveness by approving recommendations resulting from ESMP assessment and program review results

Analysis and Evaluation:

The President communicates institutional values, goals, institution-set standards, and direction to the College by approving formal recommendations submitted through the governance process
including any changes to planning procedures, reporting at local and District committees, holding meetings with community leaders, developing and approving the College budget, and hiring personnel.

The College Council submits formal written recommendations on resource allocation, operational decision-making, and institution-wide quality assurance and process improvement to the college President. If the recommendation is accepted, the President signs and returns the form at the next meeting. If the recommendation is rejected, the President provides a written response at the next meeting. The outcome is noted in the minutes and the recommendation is posted online by the College Council co-chairs. The Academic Senate submits formal written recommendations on academic and professional matters to the President. The President can approve, approve with modifications, or reject a resolution. If modified or rejected, the President provides a written explanation to the Academic Senate per Title 5. The outcome is noted in the minutes and the Academic Senate President posts the recommendation online.

The President regularly attends the College Council, Bond Citizen Oversight committee, District Board of Trustees, District President’s Council, District Budget Committee, District Whistleblower Committee, District Executive Budget Committee, and District Chief Instructional Officer’s Committee. The President attends the District Accreditation Planning group and attends LACC accreditation team meetings. The President periodically attends the Department Chairs Council, Enrollment Management Team, and other campus committees as necessary. The President meets regularly with senior staff (the President and three vice presidents), management team (all the deans and classified management), and has regular consultations with the Sheriff, Academic Senate, AFT-1521, SEIU-721, and Faculty Union. The President attends District meetings as required and is an ex officio member of the LACC Foundation Board. Outside of LACC and the LACCD, the President is a member of the LA Chamber of Commerce and the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. The 10,000 Business program with Goldman Sachs (a subcontract under Long Beach) reports directly to the President.

The President initiates regular communication with the campus through the fall and spring President newsletters, City Chatter newsletter that provides information on campus events, and through regular town halls such as the Days of the Dialogue. The President makes frequent presentations to the Board of Trustees on campus planning, organizing, and budget including the District Budget Committee (2014), Outreach and Recruitment Committee (January 2015), Facilities Committee updates/reports (2014), Strategic Plan (2014), Equity Plan (2014), and new mission (2014).

The President approves the college budget (link to process in the District procurement handbook). The management team, headed by the President, is given printouts of all budget expenditures during each meeting, with a focus on negative balances and making appropriate transfers as necessary. In 2014 a new process was initiated to ensure that senior staff does a quarterly check of all budget expenditures, including such funds as SSSP.

In selecting personnel, the President adheres to all contracts. The President does the final interview on all probationary faculty hires and classified and academic administrators. The
The probationary faculty hiring prioritization list is submitted to the President, who has the opportunity to make edits and return the list to the Academic Senate (link to HPC Process). Classified hires are done in a similar manner (link to new Classified Hiring Process). The President does evaluations on all vice presidents and has final sign-off on all administrator evaluations.

The Professional Development committee provides regular reports to the President, ensuring that professional development opportunities exist for all campus personnel. The President encourages leadership by ensuring that the vice presidents participate in state conferences. The President has approved the FTLACC intervention of Achieving the Dream to provide training for all new employees. LACC representatives will be attending the next conference. The President supports leadership training, including trainings in legal counsel, Blackboard technology, and sexual assault. The President meets with high school principals through the Area Superintendent and Principals monthly meetings that give the College the opportunity to highlight programs and scholarships.

The President oversees institutional effectiveness. The integrated planning cycle is based on a culture of evidence and focuses on student learning. The President approves the College mission, ESMP, results of comprehensive and annual program review, and budget prioritization process (link to flowcharts in the Int Plan Handbook). The President was an integral part of the writing of the Integrated Planning Handbook. The Dean of Institutional Advancement reports to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, though both make regular reports and share data with the President. The integrated planning cycle ensures that data on student achievement and student learning is used for unit and College planning, which guides resource allocation (link to appropriate pages in Int Plan Handbook).

The President receives periodic updates from senior staff on access and success measures, Title V grants, and construction timelines, among other relevant data. Senior staff reviews enrollment data and other issues on a daily basis leading up to beginning of each semester. Program review results are reviewed by the President and recommendations resulting from program review results are considered at College Council and approved by the President. These results include an assessment of data and analyses of institutional performance on ESMP measures and unit planning objectives.

The College president has been honored with three prestigious awards: Distinguished Alumni for College of Health & Human Services, California State University; Outstanding Alumni, Sacred Heart of Jesus High School; and Outstanding Community Leader, East Los Angeles Community Center.

For a list of major developments at the College since the last educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, see Section I: Introduction.

**Standard IV.B.2.**
The CEO plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. The CEO delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The College’s administrative structure supports the academic affairs, student services, and administrative services divisions (link to org chart)
- The President evaluates the administrative structure through the program review, planning, and budget prioritization processes (link to Integrated Planning Handbook integrated planning cycle pages)
- All administrators working directly under the president have clearly defined job descriptions (find link online at District site).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College’s administrative structure is comparable to other similarly sized higher education institutions (link to org chart). Evaluation of the administrative structure occurs through the planning to budget prioritization process. All campus areas write unit planning objectives that are reviewed by the President. Final budget prioritizations are approved by the President. Through this process the President reviews hiring needs, including probationary faculty and classified staff (link to HPC Policy and Classified Hiring Policy). All notice of intent to fill positions are signed off by the President after budgets are identified (evidence in the HR Guide). Evaluations of vice presidents are done annually using a District HR template, with the results stored in the President’s office and at the District Deputy Chancellor’s office.

All administrators working directly under the president have clearly defined job descriptions (find link online at District site). Evaluations of deans occur once a year and job duty statements are updated annually and also includes a mid-year review (link to the Teamsters Collective Bargaining Agreement pages).

In fall 2013 academic affairs IDWGs were realigned based on a review of IDWG dean job descriptions and department alignments (find documentation of this). The purpose was to allow one dean to focus on first year experience, student success, and Achieving the Dream. Department oversight was realigned in consultation with the Teamsters. In fall 2014 the vice president evaluation template was edited by all District presidents and put online. In spring 2015 the president recognized a need to codify grant development at the campus to ensure that all new grants clearly supported the ESMP. The decision was made to hire a new Strategic Program Support and Resource Development dean to oversee grants. As another example, the International Studies Program coordinator was a faculty position, but was changed to a classified position to align with what other colleges are doing.

The College agrees that the President provides effective leadership in selecting and developing personnel (2014: 50%; 2015: 44%). (LACC Campus Climate Survey, 2014, 2015.)
Standard IV.B.3.

Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by:

- establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- ensuring the college sets institutional performance standards for student achievement;
- ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions;
- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and allocation to support student achievement and learning;
- ensuring that the allocation of resources supports and improves learning and achievement; and
- establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Values, goals, and priorities are established in the mission, ESMP, and annual ESMP priorities (link to mission, ESMP, and CC recommendation with annual priorities)
- Institutional performance standards for student achievement are assessed annually through the ESMP implementation grid (link to ESMP implementation grid)
- Evaluation and planning rely on external and internal data analysis such as access and success measures, SLO assessment results, and campus surveys (link to program review data sets; SLO assessment results)
- Planning culminates in resource requests, which are prioritized based on alignment with ESMP objectives and College priorities in support of student achievement and learning (link to Integrated Planning Handbook flowcharts; resource request budget prioritization rubric; link to final budget summary)
- The ESMP allows the College to evaluate whether institutional planning and implementation efforts achieve the mission of the institution (link to ESMP; ESMP implementation grid; SharePoint site with committee oversight of ESMP)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Through recommendations from the College Council and Academic Affairs, the President guides College improvement. Through the integrated planning process the mission, ESMP, and College priorities are written and evaluated and institution standards are set. The integrated planning cycle is ensures campus wide, collegial participation (10+1 Consultation Agreement; Integrated Planning Handbook pages on committees). At the unit level, planning occurs as a result of external and internal data analysis in program review, including access and success measures, SLO assessment results, and campus surveys. The analysis results in unit planning objectives, which are supported through resource requests that are prioritized in terms of how well they support College priorities (Integrated Planning Handbook; link to CC recommendation with annual priorities). At the unit level, the President reviews the results of program review by
evaluating the EPPIC Program Review Summary and approves the final resource request prioritization. At the College level, the President reviews the evaluation of planning activities towards achieving the mission (ESMP implementation grid; Committee annual assessments towards achieving the ESMP). All recommendations that result from the integrated planning process come through the College Council and Academic Senate, which are approved by the President.

**Standard IV.B.4.**
The CEO has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- The President provides opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrative leaders to familiarize themselves with eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, and Commission policies
- The Accreditation Team and accreditation steering committee have membership including faculty, staff, and administrative leaders, and both report regularly to the President (operating agreements; minutes)
- The online SharePoint accreditation website houses all information pertinent to the College’s accreditation efforts (link to website)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The President assigned the ALO position to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and reassigned a faculty member as accreditation co-chair. The President authorized the Accreditation Team and accreditation steering committee to ensure College compliance with all accreditation requirements, standards, and policies. The President meets regularly with the accreditation co-chairs and attends Accreditation Team and steering committee meetings. The membership of the Accreditation Team and accreditation steering committee ensures faculty, staff, and administrative leaders are part of the process. The steering committee has co-chairs from faculty and administration, while the Accreditation Team has representation from all campus constituencies (operating agreements).

The online SharePoint accreditation website ensures open access to information and transparency about the College’s accreditation efforts. The President encourages all faculty and classified staff to take the online accreditation training. As of fall 2015, X# (ask Ronda Goudeau or Colleen Stringfellow) completed the test.

The President has either attended or sent representatives to accreditation workshops to ensure familiarity with the new standards and policies. These include the Faculty Symposium (August
27, 2015; August 28, 2014; August 22, 2013), Accreditation Kickoff (May 10, 2013); Accreditation Summit at Valley College (September 20, 2013), ASCCC Regional Workshop on quality assurance and SLO assessment at College of the Desert (October 4, 2013), ASCCC Accreditation Institute in La Jolla including a presentation by the accreditation co-chair (February 8, 2014), District Workshop on ACCJC standards at Trade Tech College (March 7, 2014), District Workshop on ACCJC standards at Mission College (April 28, 2014), Achieving the Dream workshop on ACCJC standards at Valley College (May 30, 2014), ACCJC Regional Workshop at Citrus College (September 19, 2014), District Academic Senate Summit (September 26, 2014), LACC Days of Dialogue focusing on ACCJC standards (February 26, March 24, April 21, April 28, May 21, 2015), and ASCCC Accreditation Institute in San Mateo (February 21, 2015).

The President served as the accreditation chair for Berkeley City College in spring 2015 and encouraged the vice president of academic affairs and accreditation co-chair to participate as well. The President also engaged in an accreditation site visit at Lassen Community College in March 2014, and has supported numerous campus leaders to serve on other accreditation site visits, including at the College of Alameda and Ohlone College.

Standard IV.B.5.
*The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures.*

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- The President is active on all relevant District and local committees, including the District President’s Council, District President’s Cabinet, District Budget Committee, and District Executive Budget Committee *(minutes)*
- The President assures implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies through the participatory governance process and oversight committees *(Integrated Planning Handbook)*
- The President works directly with District leadership to manage the College budget *(find relevant pages in the District Planning Handbook)*
- The President is responsible for the fiscal management of the College and approves the College budget, which is overseen by the Vice President of Administrative Services and shared in the participatory governance process *(2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 preliminary and final budgets; Budget Committee operating agreement)*

Analysis and Evaluation:

The President is active on District committees including the Board of Trustees, President’s Council, Budget, Whistleblower, Executive Budget, Chief Instructional Officer’s, and Accreditation Planning. Through participation in these committees the President negotiates such budget-impacting areas as meeting the FON obligation, FTES targets, and college reserve. All information is shared with the College at monthly College Council meetings, which includes
informed representatives from the entire campus to ensure that all decisions and practices are consistent with the College mission and policies. The President makes presentations to the campus at such events as opening flex day, periodic Academic Senate reports, and other campus committees as appropriate, and with senior staff, which shares the information with relevant committees. The President also reports regularly to Bond Citizen Oversight and Accreditation Team, and periodically attends the Department Chairs Council and Enrollment Management Team. The President has regular consultations with the Sheriff, Academic Senate, AFT-1521, SEIU-721, and Faculty Union, and is an ex officio member of the LACC Foundation Board.

The President ensures that all statutes, regulations and governing board policies are followed. If there are questions about whether or not proposed actions are appropriate, the President consults with District legal counsel and District human resources. Examples of how the President ensures that statutes, regulations, and policies are followed at the College level include:

- internal and external audit findings
- follow-up on findings from student complaints and student discipline
- Cleary Report findings (Cleary Act Crime Statistics)
- Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) group findings
- Title 9 regulations with the management team
- proof of compliance with required trainings, including sexual assault, right to privacy, and faculty-student behavior
- written directives on updates or new statues, regulations, and governing board policies are distributed to the senior staff/deans/campus
- implementation of Board of Trustees policy on guns on campus
- development of an active shooter process

(link to some emails, SharePoint pages, President’s reports, and newsletters that prove the above)

Implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies occurs through the participatory governance process and oversight committees. For example, the curriculum approval process ensures that the Academic Senate has authority as per Ed Code and Title 5, the bond process is overseen by mandatory Bond Steering and Bond Oversight committees, and the Foundation complies with law. In each of these cases, the President’s signature assures that the process, regulations, and policies are being followed.

Fiscal management is overseen by the Vice President of Administrative Services and is monitored by the Budget Committee. The President attends Budget Committee meeting, participates in the annual budget process, and approves resource request prioritizations and the overall college budget (link to process in the District procurement handbook). The management team, headed by the President, reviews expenditures at each meeting, with a focus on negative balances and making transfers as necessary. In 2014 a new process was initiated to ensure that senior staff does a quarterly check of all budget expenditures, including such funds as SSSP (documentation?). The College ended in a deficit in 2009-10 (or 10-11? Anil Jain?) and 2014-15 due to an emphasis on increasing FTES, and balanced its budget in the other years (link to 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 preliminary and final budgets). The 2010 deficit was deferred until 2014-15. Repayment of the 2014-15 deficit will begin in 2016-17. A plan is in place for the
District to provide support for more effective enrollment management towards meeting FTES targets.

**Standard IV.B.6.**
_The CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution._

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- The President maintains extensive communication with local stakeholders, businesses, political leaders, feeder high schools, and transfer universities (_President’s calendar?_)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

In addition to regular presentations and meetings with College participatory governance committees, which include representation from all campus constituencies, the President communicates extensively with the surrounding community, including meetings and presentations with:

- Los Angeles Chamber
- Executive board (ex officio) of the LACC Foundation
- Local high school principals, including Area Superintendent and Principals monthly meetings, to inform the schools about LACC’s offerings
- Congressional leadership including Schiff, DeLeon, and LaBonge about Achieving the Dream and First Year Experience
- Potential donors for funding programs
- Van de Kamp’s
- 10,000 Business program
- Title 5 grant with West Los Angeles
- High Tech grant with Pierce, Valley, West, Harbor, and Southwest
- Associated Student Government’s food program
- LAUSD Trustees
- Transfer BA Program Child Development, which was recognized by Sacramento
- STEM program collaboration with East LA and CSU-LA, also publicly recognized
- Leadership from UCLA, CSU Northridge, Woodbury College, Pacific Oaks College about increasing collaboration
- Morgan-Chase, through the College’s WorkForce Academy
- Catholic Diocese and Archbishop Gomez (November 2014)
- Promise Neighborhood Advisory, focusing on grant writing
- 13 congressional district legislatures
- Cal State LA Child Development majors
- Speaking at the East LA Generational Poverty Program and Cal State LA Raza graduates
- Recognition by USA Funds for our financial aid work
- Panel presentation with Holly Mitchell and Assemblywoman Roybal Allard
- Solicitation of funds for the Presidential Scholarship
- Emailing the President Newsletter and City Chatter, which provides updates and news about College recognition, congratulations, staffing changes, new programs, new bills
- Recognition by the East LA Community Youth Center (Angel Award for Educational Leader of the Year)

Other interactions with the surrounding community include:
- Vice Presidents attendance at Hollywood Chamber meetings
- Vice President attendance at LACC Foundation meetings
- Senior staff meeting with branding consultants to increase awareness

Employees agree that the LACC President effectively communicates the College’s values, goals, priorities, and commitment to student learning (2014: 64%; 2015: 58%) and District issues (2014: 57%; 2015: 51%) with the campus community.
Standard IV.C. Governing Board

Standard IV.C.1.
The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.

The Los Angeles Community College District’s Governing Board (Board) was authorized by the California Legislature in 1967, in accordance with Education Code sections 70902 and 72000. The Board consists of seven members elected by voters of the school districts composing the District. The Board of Trustees approves all courses, both for credit and noncredit, as well as degree and certificate programs. The Board, through policy and action, exercises oversight of student success, persistence, retention, and the quality of instruction. (IV.C.1-1 BR 2100)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. The Board sets policies and monitors the colleges’ programs, services, plans for growth and development, and ensures the institution’s mission is achieved through Board Rules, Chancellor Directives, and Administrative Regulations. (IV.C.1-2 BR 2300-2303); (IV.C.1-3 Chancellor Directives, 8/3/15); (IV.C.1-4 Administrative Regulations, 8/3/15)

b. In addition, the Board establishes rules and regulations related to academic quality and integrity, fiscal integrity and stability, student equity and conduct, and accountability and accreditation. (IV.C.1-5 BR 2305-2315); (IV.C.1-6 Add Revisions to 6300)

c. The Board, through its standing and ad hoc committees, receives and reviews information and sets policy to ensure the effectiveness of student learning programs and services, as well as the institutions’ financial stability. (IV.C.1-7 BR 2604-2607.15)

d. The Board exercises responsibility for monitoring academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness through (1) the approval of all new courses and programs, (2) regular institutional effectiveness reports, (3) yearly review of offerings to underprepared students, and (4) in-depth policy discussions related to student achievement. (IV.C.1-8 BOT agenda & minutes for 2/9/11); (IV.C.1-9 BOT agenda & minutes for 3/7/12); (IV.C.1-10 BOT agenda & minutes for 4/3/13); (IV.C.1-11 BOT agenda & minutes for 4/23/14); (IV.C.1-12 BOT agenda & minutes for 1/14/15)

e. The Board receives quarterly financial reports, allowing it to closely monitor the fiscal stability of the District. Board agendas are structured under specific areas: Budget and Finance (BF items), Business Services (BSD items), Human Resources (HRD items), Educational Services (ISD items), Facilities (FPD items), Chancellors Office (CH items) and Personnel Commission (PC items). This structure allows for full information on individual topics to be provided in advance of Board meetings. (IV.C.1-13 BOT agenda & minutes for 11/2/11); (IV.C.1-14 BOT agenda & minutes for 11/7/12); (IV.C.1-15 BOT agenda &
Analysis and Evaluation

The LACCD Board of Trustees has authority over, and responsibility for, all aspects of the institution as established in policy and documented in practice. The Board exercises its legal authority and fulfills the responsibilities specified in policy and law. Board agendas are highly detailed and Board members closely monitor all areas of their responsibility, as evidenced in Board meeting calendars, meeting agendas, Board information packets, reports, and minutes.

Board policies governing academic quality are routinely reviewed by designated ESC divisions for compliance and effectiveness and, where needed, updated. The Board routinely reviews student outcomes and, with input from the faculty, student and administrative leadership, sets policy to strengthen institutional effectiveness. The Board receives monthly, quarterly and semi-annual financial information, including enrollment projects and bond construction updates, and acts in accordance with established fiscal policies. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence for Standard for IV.C.1

IV.C.1-1 – Board Rule 2100  
IV.C.1-2 – Board Rule 2300-2303  
IV.C.1-3 – Chancellor Directives, 8/3/15  
IV.C.1-4 – Administrative Regulations, 8/3/15  
IV.C.1-5 – Board Rule 2305-2315  
IV.C.1-6 – revised Board Rule 6300  
IV.C.1-7 – Board Rule 2604-2607.15  
IV.C.1-8 – BOT agenda & minutes for 2/9/11  
IV.C.1-9 – BOT agenda & minutes for 3/7/12  
IV.C.1-10 – BOT agenda & minutes for 4/3/13  
IV.C.1-11 – BOT agenda & minutes for 4/23/14  
IV.C.1-12 – BOT agenda & minutes for 1/14/15  
IV.C.1-13 – BOT agenda & minutes for 11/2/11  
IV.C.1-14 – BOT agenda & minutes for 11/7/12  
IV.C.1-15 – BOT agenda & minutes for 11/6/13  
IV.C.1-16 – BOT agenda & minutes for 5/14/14  
IV.C.1-17 – BOT agenda & minutes for 4/15/15

Standard IV.C.2.

The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.

The Board of Trustees is a highly engaged entity. Board members bring differing backgrounds and perspectives to their positions. At meetings, they engage in full and vigorous discussion of
agenda items and share individual viewpoints. However, once a decision is reached and members have voted, they move forward in a united fashion.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. The Board’s commitment to act as a unified body is reflected in their Code of Ethical Conduct where Trustees “recognize that governing authority rests with the entire Board, not with me as an individual. I will give appropriate support to all policies and actions taken by the Board at official meetings.” (IV.C.2-1 Board Rule 2300.10)

b. Consent agenda items are frequently singled out for separate discussion or vote at the request of individual Board members. Once all members have had a chance to make their views known and a vote is taken, the agenda moves forward without further discussion. Examples of decisions where Trustees have held divergent views, yet acted as a collective entity, include approval of Van de Kamp Innovation Center, the approval of the lease for the Harbor College Teacher Preparatory Academy, student expulsions, ratification of lobbying service contracts, and revision to graduation requirements. (IV.C.2-2 BOT Minutes Consent Items Discussions, 2012-2015)

**Analysis and Evaluation**

Board policies and procedures provide a framework for members’ collective action and guide Board discussion, voting, and behavior during and outside of Board meetings. Board members are able to engage in debate and present multiple perspectives during open discussion but still come to collective decisions and support those decisions once reached. Minutes from Board actions from recent years substantiate this behavior. The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence List for Standard for IV.C.2**

IV.C.2-1 – Board Rule 2300.10
IV.C.2-2 – BOT Minutes Consent Items Discussions, 2012-2015

**Standard IV.C.3.**

The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the district/system.

The Board follows California Education Code, Board policies, and the District’s Human Resource Guide R-110 in the selection and evaluation of the Chancellor and college presidents.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Selection of Chancellor

a. The hiring of a Chancellor starts with Board action authorizing the Human Resources Division to launch a search. The Board then hires an executive search firm and oversees the Chancellor selection process. (IV.C.3-1 HR R-110); (IV.C.3-2 BOT Agenda, BT6, Chancellor search, 5/1/13)

b. The most recent Chancellor search (2013) illustrates the process. The Board hired an executive search firm, which then convened focus group/town hall meetings at all colleges and the Educational Services Center. During these meetings, employee and student input was solicited to develop a “Chancellor’s Profile” describing the desired qualities and characteristics for a new leader. The Chancellor’s Profile was used to develop a job description and timeline for selection and hiring of the new Chancellor. (IV.C.3-3 Chancellor Profile Development Announcement, 5/9/13); (IV.C.3-4 Chancellor Job Description, May 2013); (IV.C.3-5 Chancellor Selection Timeline, May 2013)

c. The Board’s search committee began meeting in August 2013 and began interviewing candidates in October 2013. The Board held closed sessions related to the selection of the Chancellor from October 2013-March 2014. On March 13, 2014, the Board announced its selection of Dr. Francisco Rodriguez. Dr. Rodriguez began his tenure as LACCD Chancellor on June 1, 2014. (IV.C.3-6 Chancellor Search Announcement, 5/1/13); (IV.C.3-7 closed Board session agendas 2013-2014); (IV.C.3-8 LA Times article, 3/13/14)

Evaluation of Chancellor

d. The Chancellor’s contract includes a provision for an annual evaluation to be conducted by the Board of Trustees. General Counsel is the designated District entity who works with the Board during this process. (IV.C.3-9 Chancellor’s Directive 122)

e. Chancellor’s Directive 122 Evaluation of the Chancellor indicates that the Board may solicit input from various constituents, typically including the college presidents, District senior staff, the Academic Senate presidents and union representatives. It also states the Chancellor will prepare and submit a written self-evaluation, based upon his or her stated goals. (IV.C.3-10 Chancellor evaluation data collection form); (IV.C.3-11 Blank Chancellor evaluation form)

f. Once submitted, the Board discusses drafts of the evaluation in closed session. When their assessment is complete, the Board meets with the Chancellor and s/he is provided the final, written document. A signed copy of the Chancellor’s evaluation is maintained in the Office of General Counsel. (IV.C.3-12 BOT Chancellor evaluation closed session agendas 11/2014-6/2015)
Selection of College Presidents

g. The Board shares responsibility with the Chancellor for hiring and evaluating the performance of college presidents. Board Rule 10308 specifies the selection procedures, which typically involve national searches. (IV.C.3-13 BR 10308)

h. Board action is required to initiate the presidential search process, directing the Chancellor to begin the process pursuant to Board Rule 10308. Recent Board actions authorizing president searches include Harbor, Southwest and Valley Colleges in June 2014, and West Los Angeles College in June 2015. (IV.C.3-14 HRD1 Board resolution, 6/25/14); (IV.C.3-15 HRD1 Board resolution, 6/25/15)

i. Per the timeline set by Board action, the Chancellor convenes a Presidential Search Committee comprised of representatives of all stakeholder groups per Board Rule 10308. After consultation with the Board and Presidential Search Committee of the applicable college, the Chancellor oversees the recruitment and advertising plan, which may include the retention of a search firm upon Board approval. The Presidential Search Committee forwards at least three unranked semifinalists to the Chancellor.

j. After conducting interviews, the Chancellor compiles information from background and reference checks and forwards the names of the finalist(s) to the Board of Trustees for consideration. The Board holds closed Board sessions on presidential selection when interviewing candidates. (IV.C.3-16 BOT closed agendas 5/2010-6/2015)

Evaluation of College Presidents

k. As detailed in Chancellor’s Directive 122, contracts for college presidents include a provision for an annual evaluation conducted by the Chancellor. College presidents complete an annual Presidential Self-Assessment, update their goals for the following year, and meet with the Chancellor to review both documents. In addition, presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least every three years. In this process, the president’s self-evaluation is supplemented by an evaluation committee, which collects input from peers and completes the Presidential Evaluation Data Collection form. The Chancellor then prepares a summary evaluation memo which is shared with the college president. (IV.C.3-9 Chancellor’s Directive 122); (IV.C.3-17 Performance evaluation process for college presidents)

l. The presidential evaluation process is used to determine salary increases, as well as recommendations to the Board on the renewal of contracts. Corrective action, if needed, can include suspension, reassignment, or resignation. (IV.C.3-18 Closed Board meeting agendas on presidential evaluations 8/2010-6/2014)
Analysis and Evaluation

The Board takes its responsibility for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor very seriously, following a set selection and evaluation process. In turn, the Chancellor is responsible for selecting and evaluating those who directly report to him/her (including college presidents, general counsel, the deputy chancellor and vice chancellors). With the assistance of the Human Resources division, the Chancellor and Board have followed selection and evaluation requirements for its senior administrators. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard for IV.C.3

IV.C.3-1 – HR R-110
IV.C.3-2 – BOT Agenda, BT6, Chancellor search, 5/1/13
IV.C.3-3 – Chancellor Profile Development Announcement, 5/9/13
IV.C.3-4 – Chancellor Job Description, May 2013
IV.C.3-5 – Chancellor Selection Timeline, May 2013
IV.C.3-6 – Chancellor Search Announcement, 5/1/13
IV.C.3-7 – Chancellor selection closed Board session agendas 2013-2014
IV.C.3-8 – LA Times article, 3/13/14
IV.C.3-9 – Chancellor’s Directive 122
IV.C.3-10 – Chancellor evaluation data collection form, 12/5/07
IV.C.3-11 – Blank Chancellor evaluation form
IV.C.3-12 – BOT Agendas, Chancellor evaluation closed sessions, 11/19/14-6/13/15
IV.C.3-13 – Board Rule 10308
IV.C.3-14 – HRD1 Board resolution, 6/25/14
IV.C.3-15 – HRD1 Board resolution, 6/24/15
IV.C.3-16 – BOT closed agendas president selection 5/2010-6/2015
IV.C.3-17 – Performance Evaluation Process for college presidents
IV.C.3-18 – BOT closed agendas president evaluations 8/2010-6/2014

The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution’s educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure.

The Board of Trustees consists of seven members elected for four-year terms by qualified voters of the school districts composing the Los Angeles Community College District. The Board also has a Student Trustee, elected by students for a one-year term. The Student Trustee has an advisory vote on actions other than personnel-related and collective bargaining items. (IV.C.4-1 Board Rule 2101-2102); (IV.C.4-2 Board Rule 21001.13)
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. Board rules mandate that the Board act as an independent policy-making body reflecting the public interest. Board policy states that the Board, acting through the Chancellor, or designee, monitors, supports, and opposes local, state and national legislation to “…protect and to promote the interests of the Los Angeles Community College District.” (IV.C.4-3 Board Rule 2300); (IV.C.4-4 Board Rule 1200-1201)

b. The Board independently carries out its policy-making role through four standing committees: Budget and Finance, Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success, Legislative and Public Affairs, and Facilities Master Planning and Oversight. (IV.C.4-5 Board Rule 2605.11)

c. The Board forms additional ad hoc committees and subcommittees to investigate and address specific policy issues. They formed the following ad hoc committees during the 2014-15 year: (1) Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness; (2) Outreach and Recruitment; (3) Environmental Stewardship; and (4) Summer Youth Employment. Two subcommittees were formed during this same period: Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness. Previous years’ ad hoc committees have included Adult Education and Workforce Development (January 2014), Contractor Debarment (November 2011) and the Personnel Commission (January 2014). (IV.C.4-6 BOT Ad Hoc Committees, 8/4/15)

d. The Board maintains its independence as a policy-making body by studying all materials in advance of meetings, being well-informed before engaging in District business, and asking questions and requesting additional information as needed. Before each Board or committee meeting, members receive a Board Letter, detailing all pending actions, follow-up on previous requests, and information related to personnel, litigation, and other confidential matters. (IV.C.4-7 Board letters, 2013-2015)

e. Board members engage with local communities across the District. They receive a wide range of input from community and constituent groups by holding meetings at the nine colleges in addition to the District office. This practice helps broaden Board members’ perspectives on colleges’ diversity and the educational quality issues affecting individual colleges. Members of the public have the opportunity to express their perspectives during the public comments section of each Board meeting, when individual agenda items are under consideration, and through direct correspondence with the Board. Such input contributes to the Board’s understanding of the public interest in institutional quality and is taken into consideration during deliberations. (IV.C.4-8 BOT minutes, public agenda speakers, 2015); (IV.C.4-9 BOT minutes, educational quality speakers, 2015)

f. Additionally, members of the public can submit direct inquiries to the Board via the District website and will receive a response coordinated by the Chancellor’s Office. (IV.C.4-10 Screenshot of Public Inquiry Email to Board President)
g. The Board’s role in protecting and promoting the interests of the LACCD is clearly articulated in Board Rules. The Board has historically defended and protected the institution from undue influence or political pressure. For example, the Board heard from numerous constituents who spoke against the Van de Kamp Innovation Center and the discontinuance of LA Pierce College’s Farm contractor during public agenda requests at Board meetings. The Board follows Board Rules in considering these issues, then makes independent decisions based on the best interest of the institution, educational quality, and its students. (IV.C.4-11 Board Rule 3002-3003.30); (IV.C.4-12 BOT minutes, VKC and Farm, 10/15/11 and 4/29/15)

h. The Board engages in advocacy efforts on behalf of the District in particular, and community colleges in general, through its legislative advocates in Sacramento and in Washington, DC. Annually, the Board sets its policy and legislative priorities in consultation with the Chancellor, their State legislative consultant, McCallum Group Inc., and federal lobbyist firm, Holland and Knight. The Board regularly discusses and takes action, either in support of or against, state and federal legislation with the potential to affect the District and its students. (IV.C.4-13 Legislative and Public Affairs Committee agenda, Board Legislative Priorities for 2015, 11/19/14); (IV.C.4-14 BOT agendas, Legislative advocacy, 2015); (IV.C.4-15 BOT minutes, 2015-16 Federal Legislative Priorities, 8/19/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

Board members work together collaboratively to advocate for and defend the interests of the District. Public input on the quality of education and college operations is facilitated through open session comments at Board meetings, and through the Board’s consistent adherence to open meeting laws and principles. The LACCD service area is extremely dense and politically diverse, and members of the public advocate strongly for their respective interests. Regardless, through the years, the Board of Trustees has remained focused on its role as an independent policymaking body and diligently supports the interests of the colleges and District in the face of external pressure. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard IV.C.4

IV.C.4-1 – Board Rule 2101-2102
IV.C.4-2 – Board Rule 21001.13
IV.C.4-3 – Board Rule 2300
IV.C.4-4 – Board Rule 1200-1201
IV.C.4-5 – Board Rule 2605.11
IV.C.4-6 – BOT Ad Hoc Committees, 8/4/15
IV.C.4-7 – Board letters, 2013-2015
IV.C.4-8 – BOT minutes, public agenda speakers, 2015
IV.C.4-9 – BOT minutes, educational quality speakers, 2015
IV.C.4-10 – Screenshot of Public Inquiry Email to Board President
IV.C.4-11 – Board Rule 3002-3003.30
Standard IV.C.5.
The governing board establishes policies consistent with the district mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.

The Board sets and updates policies consistent with the District’s mission, and monitors their implementation to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. Recent Board actions include revising and strengthening rules governing academic probation and disqualification (BR 8200); graduation, General Education and IGETC/CSU requirements (BR 6200); and academic standards, grading and grade symbols (BR 6700). Active faculty participation through the District Academic Senate provides the Board with professional expertise in the area of academic quality.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Educational Quality, Integrity and Improvement

a. The Board’s policies regarding educational programs and academic standards help ensure that the mission of the Los Angeles Community College District is realized in providing “…our students [with] an excellent education that prepares them to transfer to four-year institutions, successfully complete workforce development programs designed to meet local and statewide needs, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement.” (IV.C.5-1 Board Rule 2300-2303.16 and 2305); (IV.C.5-2 Board Rule 1200)

b. Chapter VI of LACCD Board Rules (Instruction, Articles I-VIII), establishes academic standards, sets policies for graduation, curriculum development and approval, and sets criteria for program review, viability, and termination. Regulations governing educational programs are implemented as detailed in Section IV of LACCD Administrative Regulations (“E-Regs”) (see Standard IV.C.1). (IV.C.5-3 BR Ch. VI, Articles I-VIII Instruction)

c. The Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee “…fulfills an advisory, monitoring and coordinating role regarding accreditation, planning, student success and curriculum matters. The committee’s responsibilities include the coordination of accreditation activities, oversight of District-wide planning processes and all issues affecting student success, academic policies and programmatic changes. Its specific charge is to: 1) Review and approve a coordinated timeline for institutional effectiveness and accreditation planning processes throughout the District; 2) Review and provide feedback on indicators of
institutional effectiveness so that common elements, themes, and terms can be identified, reviewed and agreed upon; 3) Monitor college compliance with the Standards of Accreditation of the Association of Community Colleges and Junior Colleges; 4) Monitor existing planning and evaluation practices relative to student completion initiatives; and 5) Facilitate the review, update and revision of the long-range strategic plan and goals every five years; and 6) Discuss potential new or revised curricular programs and services within the District, and encourage the development of new programs and services as may be appropriate.” (IV.C.5-4 Board Rule 2605.11)

d. The IESS Committee reviews, provides feedback on, and approves reports containing institutional effectiveness and student success indicators. For example, this Committee reviews colleges’ Student Equity Plans, Strategic Plans, and mission statements. Board members are actively engaged in asking for clarification on college reports, presentations, and plans to better their understanding and support of the colleges (see Standard IV.C.8). (IV.C.5-5 BR 2314)

Ensuring Resources

e. The Board ensures colleges have the necessary resources to deliver quality student learning programs and services. Board support is evidenced in budget policies, the budget development calendar, and the tentative and final budgets, which are reviewed and approved after substantial discussion. Allocation formulas are implemented to ensure appropriate distribution of funds are made that are consistent with the District’s and colleges’ mission to support the integrity, quality and improvement of student learning programs and services (see Standard III.D.11). (IV.C.5-6 Board Rule 2305 and7600-7606); (IV.C.5-7 LACCD Budget Development Calendar); (IV.C.5-8 2015-2016 Final Budget); (IV.C.5-9 District Allocation Mechanism amendment, 6/3/12)

f. The Board’s Legislative and Public Affairs Committee monitors legislative initiatives and pending legislation which may affect the District, and advocates for policies which will have a positive impact. The Chancellor and Board members meet regularly with state lawmakers and educational leaders to promote legislation and other initiatives intended to improve student access and secure funding for community colleges and specific programs. (IV.C.5-10 LPA minutes 2014-2015)

Financial Integrity and Stability

g. The Board is responsible for the financial integrity and stability of the District. The Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) is a standing committee of the Board whose charge is to review and recommend action on fiscal matters prior to full Board approval. As articulated in Chapter II, Article IV, 2605.11.c, the Committee recommends action on the tentative and full budget; general, internal and financial audits; quarterly financial reports, and bond financing (see Standard III.D.5). (IV.C.5-4 BR 2605.11)
h. The BFC monitors the financial stability of each college and reviews annual District financial reports as required by Board Rule 7608. The Committee critically reviews and approves monthly enrollment and FTES reports which involve members asking college presidents to elaborate on fiscal fluctuations and enrollment trends. The Committee also sets annual goals that are consistent with their role and mission to maintain financial stability for the District. (IV.C.5-11 Board Rule 7608); (IV.C.5-12 BFC minutes 11/5/14, 3/11/15 and 5/13/15); (IV.C.5-13 BFC agendas 2014-15)

i. Board policy mandates a 10% District reserve. Use of contingency reserves is only authorized upon recommendation of the Chancellor, the (Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and the District Budget Committee, and requires a super-majority vote by the full Board. (IV.C.5-14 2015-2016 Final Budget, Appendix F, Reserve policy, p. 3); (IV.C.5-15 BOT Agendas approval of contingency reserves, 7/9/14 and 8/5/15)

The Board approved Fiscal Accountability policies in October 2013. These policies hold each college, and college president, responsible for maintaining fiscal stability. Board members evaluate and authorize college’s requests for financial assistance for fiscal sustainability. (IV.C.5-16 BOT agenda BF2, 10/9/13); (IV.C.5-17 BFC minutes 6/11/14, 2/11/15 and 9/6/15 and BOT agenda, 8/5/15 regarding college financial requests)

j. The Board’s Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMPOC) oversees the Bond Construction Program. Based on recommendations made in 2012 by both an independent review panel and the ACCJC, the Board embarked on a wide range of activities to strengthen fiscal control of the Program. These actions were subsequently determined by the Commission to have resolved the issues identified in its February 7, 2014 letter to the District. (IV.C.5-18 ACCJC letter, 2/7/14)

Legal Matters

k. The Board is apprised of, and assumes responsibility for, all legal matters associated with the operation of the nine campuses and the Educational Services Center. The Board closely monitors legal issues that arise in the District, reviewing them in closed session, and approving decisions during open session as required by law. The District’s Office of General Counsel provides legal counsel to the Board and ensures the District is in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. (IV.C.5-19 BOT closed session agendas on legal issues); (IV.C.5-20 Board Rule 4001)

Analysis and Evaluation

As documented above, the standing policies and practice of the Board of Trustees demonstrates that they assume the ultimate responsibility for policies and decisions affecting educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability of the Los Angeles Community College District. The Board holds college presidents and the Chancellor, publicly accountable for meeting quality assurance standards associated with their educational and strategic planning efforts. The District meets this Standard.
Evidence List for Standard IV.C.5

IV.C.5-1 – Board Rule 2300-2303.16 and 2305
IV.C.5-2 – Board Rule 1200
IV.C.5-3 – BR Ch. VI, Articles I-VIII, Instruction
IV.C.5-4 – Board Rule 2605.11
IV.C.5-5 – Board Rule 2314
IV.C.5-6 – Board Rule 2036 and 7600-7606
IV.C.5-7 – LACCD Budget Development Calendar
IV.C.5-8 – 2015-2016 Final Budget
IV.C.5-9 – District Budget Allocation Mechanism amendment, 6/3/12
IV.C.5-10 – LPA minutes, July 2014-June 2015
IV.C.5-11 – Board Rule 7608
IV.C.5-12 – BFC minutes, Quarterly reports, 11/2014-5/2015
IV.C.5-13 – BFC agendas, 2014-15
IV.C.5-14 – 2015-2016 Final Budget, Appendix F, Reserve policy, p. 3
IV.C.5-15 – BOT Agendas approval of contingency reserves, 7/9/14 and 8/5/15
IV.C.5-16 – BOT agenda BF2, 10/9/13
IV.C.5-17 – BFC minutes 6/11/14, 2/11/15 and 9/6/15 and BOT agenda, 8/5/15 regarding college financial requests
IV.C.5-18 – ACCJC letter, 2/7/14
IV.C.5-19 – BOT closed session agenda on legal issues
IV.C.5-20 – Board Rule 4001

The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures

Chapter VI of LACCD Board Rules delineates all structural and operational matters pertaining to the Board of Trustees. Board rules are published electronically on the District website. The Office of General Counsel also maintains, and makes available to the public, paper (hard) copies of all Board rules and administrative regulations. Board rules are routinely reviewed and updated.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. Board membership, elections, mandatory orientation and annual retreats, and duties and responsibilities of the governing board are defined in Chapter II of the LACCD Board Rules. (IV.C.6-1 Screenshot of Board Rules online); (IV.C.6-2 BR 2100-2902); (IV.C.6-3 BR 21000-21010)
- **Article I – Membership** – includes membership, elections, term of office, procedure to fill vacancies, orientation, compensation and absence of both Board members and the Student Trustee.
- **Article II – Officers** – delineates the office of president, vice president, president pro tem, and secretary of the Board.
- **Article III – Duties of the Board of Trustees** - includes powers, values, expectation of ethical conduct and sanctions for failure to adhere thereby; governance, self-evaluation, disposition of District budget, calendar, monuments and donations; acceptance of funds; equity plans, and conferral of degrees.
- **Article IV – Meetings** – Regular, closed session and annual meetings; order of business, votes, agendas and public inquiries; number of votes required by type of action, and processes to change or suspend Board rules.
- **Article V – Communications to the Board** – written and oral communications; public agenda speakers; expectations of behavior at Board meetings and sanctions for violation thereof;
- **Article VI – Committees of the Board of Trustees** – delineates standing, ad hoc, citizens advisory and student affairs committees.
- **Article VII – Use of Flags** - provisions thereof.
- **Article VIII – Naming of College Facilities** – provisions to name or re-name new or existing facilities.
- **Article IX – General Provisions** – including travel on Board business; job candidate travel expenses, and approval of Board rules and administrative regulations.
- **Article X – Student Trustee Election Procedures** – including qualifications, term of office, election, replacement and other authorizations.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The Board publishes bylaws and policies which are publically available, both electronically and on paper. These policies are routinely reviewed and updated by the Office of General Counsel under the supervision of the Chancellor and the Board. The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence List for Standard IV.C.6**

IV.C.6-1 – Screenshot of Board Rules online
IV.C.6-2 – Board Rule 2100-2902
IV.C.6-3 – Board Rule 21000-21010

**Standard IV.C.7.**

*The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly assesses its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the college/district/system mission and revises them as necessary.*

The Board of Trustees is aware of, and operates in a manner consistent with, its policies and bylaws. The Board is actively engaged in regularly assessing and revising its policies and bylaws
for their effectiveness in fulfilling the colleges’ and District’s mission and commitment to educational quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. In accordance with Board Rules, the Board meets regularly during the academic year. Closed sessions, special, emergency, and annual meetings are held in accordance with related Education and Governance Codes. *(IV.C.7-1 BR 2400-2400.13); (IV.C.7-2 BR 2402-2404)*

b. As stipulated by Board rule, the Board conducts an annual orientation and training for new members; an annual self-assessment and goal-setting retreat, and an annual review of the Chancellor. Board goals are reviewed and updated annually during the Board’s annual retreat. *(IV.C.7-3 BOT agendas, 6/13/15 and 6/18/15)*

c. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the adoption, amendment or repeal of Board rules in accordance with Board Rule 2418. The process for adoption, or revision, of Board rules and the administrative regulations which support them is outlined in Chancellor’s Directive 70. As the Board’s designee, the Chancellor issues Administrative Regulations. The District adopts other procedures, such as its Business Procedures Manual and Chancellor’s Directives, to establish consistent and effective standards. *(IV.C.7-4 Chancellor’s Directive 70); (IV.C.7-5 BR 2418)*

d. The Chancellor, as the Board’s designee, assigns rules and regulations by subject area to members of his/her executive team for the triennial review. Administrative regulations stipulate the process for the cyclical review of all policies and regulations. Regulations are coded by a letter prefix which corresponds to the administrative area and “business owner,” e.g. Educational Regulations (“E-Regs”) and Student Regulations (“S-Regs”) are under the purview of the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness division. *(IV.C.7-6 Administrative Regulation C-12); (IV.C.7-7 Board Rule Review Schedule 2015); (IV.C.7-8 Admin Regs Review Schedule 2015)*

e. Under the guidance of the Chancellor, the Office of General Counsel conducts periodic reviews of Board Rules and Administrative Regulations and maintains master review records. The OGC monitors changes to Title 5 as well as State and federal law, and proposes revisions as needed. Changes to Administrative Regulations are prepared by the “business owner,” then consulted per Chancellor’s Directive 70. Formal documentation of the revision is submitted to OGC and subsequently posted on the District website. *(IV.C.7-9 Admin Reg Rev Form Template); (IV.C.7-10 E-97 review and comment)*

f. During the 2014-15 academic year, the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division reviewed and updated twenty-eight Educational Services regulations. *(IV.C.7-11 Admin Regs Review Schedule 2015); (IV.C.7-12 E-110 Confirmed Review, 4/22/15)*
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g. As noted in item ‘d’ above, designated ESC administrative areas bring proposed Board Rule revisions for review and comment to key District-level councils, committees and stakeholders prior to being noticed on the Board agenda. Board members themselves, or individuals who were not part of the consultation process, have the opportunity to comment or request more information before the rule is finalized. Approved changes are posted on the District website. (IV.C.7-13 BR 6700 consultation memo and BOT Agenda notice, 5/5/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

Trustees act in accordance with established policies. Board meeting minutes and agendas provide clear evidence of the Board acting in a manner consistent with policies and bylaws. Board rules and administrative regulations are subject to regular review and revision by both District administrative staff and the Office of General Counsel, and are fully vetted through the consultation process. The District recently subscribed to the Community College League of California’s (CCLC) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service. The receipt of CCLC notifications on State regulation and policy changes will further strengthen the District’s regular update of Board policies and procedures. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence for Standard IV.C.7

IV.C.7-1 – Board Rule 2400-2400.13
IV.C.7-2 – Board Rule 2402-2404
IV.C.7-3 – BOT agenda 6/13/15 and 6/18/15
IV.C.7-4 – Chancellor’s Directive 70
IV.C.7-5 – Board Rule 2418
IV.C.7-6 – Administrative Regulation C-12
IV.C.7-7 – Board Rule Review Schedule 2015
IV.C.7-8 – Administrative Regs Review Schedule 2015
IV.C.7-9 – Admin Reg Rev Form Template
IV.C.7-10 – E-97 review and comment
IV.C.7-11 – Admin Regs Review Schedule 2015
IV.C.7-12 – E-110 Confirmed Review, 4/22/15
IV.C.7-13 – Board Rule 6700 consultation memo and BOT Agenda notice, 5/5/15
Standard IV.C.8.
To ensure the institution is accomplishing its goals for student success, the governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality.

At set intervals throughout the year, the Board of Trustees reviews, discusses and accepts reports which address the quality of student learning and achievement. The primary, but by no means only, mechanism for such inquiry is the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS).

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. The Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee “fulfills an advisory, monitoring and coordinating role regarding accreditation, planning, student success and curriculum matters” and fulfills its charge to “review and provide feedback on indicators of institutional effectiveness so that common elements, themes, and terms can be identified, reviewed and agreed upon.” Committee reports are received on behalf of the full Board, and the Committee has the authority to request revisions or further information before recommending items to the entire Board for approval. (IV.C.8-1 BR 2605.11)

b. The Board reviews and approves colleges’ academic quality and institutional plans annually. The Board also participates in an annual review and analysis of the State’s Student Success Scorecard, which reports major indicators of student achievement. It reviews and approves colleges’ Educational and Strategic Master Plans every five years, or sooner if requested by the college. At its recent retreat, the Board reviewed national and District student completion data for the past six years. The Board discussed factors that may contribute to low completion rates and possible goals focusing on improving students’ completion rates across the District. (IV.C.8-2 IESS minutes and PPT 6/24/15); (IV.C.8-3 IESS agenda 12/17/14); (IV.C.8-4 IESS minutes 11/19/14); (IV.C.8-5 IESS minutes 9/17/14); (IV.C.8-6 IESS Min 1/29/14); (IV.C.8-7 IESS minutes 12/4/13); (IV.C.8-8 IESS minutes 11/20/13); (IV.C.8-9 BOT agenda and PPT 9/2/15); (IV.C.8-10 BOT agenda and DAS Board meeting notes 8/19/15); (IV.C.8-11 BOT agenda and PPT 5/13/15); (IV.C.8-12 BOT agenda 4/15/15); (IV.C.8-13 BOT agenda 3/11/15); (IV.C.8-14 BOT agenda 1/28/15); (IV.C.8-15 BOT minutes 8/20/14); (IV.C.8-16 BOT agenda, CH1, 2/26/14)

c. The Board has taken a special interest in the performance of underprepared students. In June 2014, the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS) requested a presentation on the success rates and challenges faced by underprepared students districtwide. In addition, the Board was updated on the number of basic skills offerings relative to the number of underprepared students by college. In response, the Board urged that more basic skills sections be offered to support the success of these students. (IV.C.8-17 IESS Agenda and Underprepared Students PPT, 6/11/14); (IV.C.8-11 BOT agenda and PPT 5/13/15)
d. The Board annually reviews student awards and transfers to four-year colleges and universities. (IV.C.8-18 IESS agenda 1/29/14); (IV.C.8-19 IESS agenda and minutes 3/26/14); (IV.C.8-20 District certificate report and degree reports, 3/26/14); (IV.C.8-21 Certificates Attached to Degrees, Summary by College, 4/29/14)

e. The Board reviews students’ perspectives on learning outcomes and key indicators of student learning as a part of the District’s biennial Student Survey. The Survey provides an opportunity for students to share their educational experiences and provide feedback to colleges and the District. (IV.C.8-22 2014 Student Survey Question 25 and results); (IV.C.8-23 IESS minutes & student survey PPT, 5/27/15)

f. In Spring 2015, the Board reviewed and approved college and District-level goals for four State-mandated Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) indicator standards on successful course completion, accreditation status, fund balances, and audit status. (IV.C.8-24 BOT agenda and PPT, 6/10/15)

g. During the approval process, accreditation reports are reviewed, especially with regard to college plans for improvement of student learning outcomes. (IV.C.8-25 BOT minutes 3/28/13); (IV.C.8-26 IESS 9/25/13); (IV.C.8-13 BOT agenda, 3/11/15)

h. In Fall 2015, the Board revised Board Rule 6300 to expressly affirm the District’s commitment to integrated planning in support of institutional effectiveness. (IV.C.8-27 BOT agenda - TBD)

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The Board is regularly informed of key indicators of student learning and achievement, both as a whole and through its Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee. Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review, discussion and input regarding student success and plans for improving academic quality.

The Board’s level of engagement, along with knowledge about student learning and achievement, has continued to grow over the years. Board members ask insightful questions and expect honest and thorough responses from the colleges. The Board sets clear expectations for improvement of student learning outcomes. The District meets this standard.

**Evidence List for Standard IV.C.8**

IV.C.8-1 – Board Rule 2605.11
IV.C.8-2 – IESS minutes and PPT 6/24/15
IV.C.8-3 – IESS agenda 12/17/14
IV.C.8-4 – IESS minutes 11/19/14
IV.C.8-5 – IESS minutes 9/17/14
IV.C.8-6 – IESS minutes 1/29/14
IV.C.8-7 – IESS minutes 12/4/13
The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

The District has a clear process for orienting Board members, which includes an overview of District operations, a review of ethical rules and responsibilities, a briefing on compliance with the Ralph M. Brown and Fair Political Practices acts, a review of the roles of auxiliary organizations and employee organizations, and a discussion about preparing for, and conduct during, Board meetings. The Chancellor, in consultation with the president of the Board, facilitates an annual Board retreat, and schedules regular educational presentations to the Board throughout the year.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Board Development

a. The Board has had a formal orientation policy since 2007. There are also long-standing procedures for the orientation of the Student Trustee. All new Board members are oriented before taking office. Most recently, orientation sessions for new members who began their terms on July 1, 2015 were conducted in June 2015. (IV.C.9-1 Board Rule 2105); (IV.C.9-2 Student Trustee Orientation procedures)
b. Board member orientation also includes an overview of the functions and responsibilities of divisions in the District office. Presentations on accreditation, conflict of interest policy, and California public meeting requirements (Brown Act) are also included in the orientation. (IV.C.9-3 BOT agenda and orientation packet, 6/4/15); (IV.C.9-4 BOT agenda and orientation packet 6/18/15)

c. A comprehensive and ongoing Board development program was implemented in 2010. Topics include Trustee roles and responsibilities; policy setting; ethical conduct; accreditation, and developing Board goals and objectives. (IV.C.9-5 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 1/20/10); (IV.C.9-6 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts 12/10/10-12/11/10); (IV.C.9-7 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/25/11-8/26/11); (IV.C.9-8 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 4/19/12); (IV.C.9-9 BOT Agenda and minutes, 9/24/12); (IV.C.9-10 BOT Agenda and minutes, 11/13/12); (IV.C.9-11 BOT minutes & Action Improvement Plan, 3/19/13); (IV.C.9-12 BOT minutes & handouts, 10/22/13); (IV.C.9-13 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/23/14); (IV.C.9-14 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 12/10/14)

d. In affirmation of their commitment to principles developed during their retreats, the Board revised their Rules to include a statement that Board members should work with the Chancellor to obtain information from staff, and avoid involvement in operational matters. Board rules were further revised to facilitate member training, conference attendance, and educational development. (IV.C.9-15 Board Rule 2300.10-2300.11)

e. Trustees are encouraged to expand their knowledge of community college issues, operations, and interests by participating in Community College League of California (CCLC) statewide meetings and other relevant conferences. Trustees also complete the online ACCJC Accreditation Basics training, with new Trustees completing this training within three months after taking office (see Standard IV.C.11). (IV.C.9-16 BOT agenda and minutes, 11/19/14 and 5/13/15); (IV.C.9-17 ACCJC training certificates from 2012)

Continuity of Board Membership

f. Board Rule Chapter II, Article 1, Section 2103 specifies the process the Board will follow in filling a vacancy which occurs between elections. The procedure ensures continuity of Board membership, as demonstrated. The Board followed the process when it appointed Angela Reddock (2007) to complete Trustee Waxman’s term, who resigned to accept a position outside of the District. The Board again followed this process when it appointed Miguel Santiago (2008) to fill the unexpired term of Trustee Warren Furutani, who was elected to another office. More recently, when Trustee Santiago was elected to the State Assembly, the Board determined not to fill his unexpired term, as the length of time between his departure (December 2014) and the next election (March 2015) was allowed by law. The Board subsequently voted to appoint the individual elected to fill the vacant seat, Mike Fong, for the period remaining in the unexpired term (March 2015 to June 2015). (IV.C.9-18 Board Rule 2103); (IV.C.9-19 BOT minutes 4/11/07); (IV.C.9-20 BOT Agenda 3/11/15)
g. Trustee elections are held on a staggered basis, with members serving four-year terms. An election is held every two years to fill either three or four seats. Three new Board members were elected in March 2015 with terms beginning July 1, 2015. A districtwide student election is held annually to select a student member, who has an advisory vote, in accordance with Board Rule Chapter II Article X. (IV.C.9-20 BR 2102); (IV.C.9-21 BR 21000)

Analysis and Evaluation

The Board has a robust and consistent program of orientation as well as ongoing development and self-evaluation. Board members have demonstrated a commitment to fulfilling their policy and oversight role, and a responsibility for ensuring educational quality. The Board had followed policy in ensuring continuity of Board membership when vacancies have occurred. The staggering of Board elections has provided consistency in recent years and incumbents are frequently re-elected to their positions, providing continuity of governance. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard IV.C.9

IV.C.9-1 – Board Rule 2105
IV.C.9-2 – Student trustee orientation procedures
IV.C.9-3 – BOT orientation agenda and packet, 6/4/15
IV.C.9-4 – BOT orientation agenda and packet, 6/18/15
IV.C.9-5 – BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 1/20/10
IV.C.9-6 – BOT Agenda and minutes, 12/10/10-12/11/10
IV.C.9-7 – BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 8/25/11-8/26/11
IV.C.9-8 – BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 4/19/12
IV.C.9-9 – BOT Agenda and minutes, 9/24/12
IV.C.9-10 – BOT Agenda and minutes, 11/13/12
IV.C.9-11 – BOT minutes and Action Improvement Plan, 3/19/13
IV.C.9-12 – BOT minutes & handouts, 10/22/13
IV.C.9-13 – BOT agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/23/14
IV.C.9-14 – BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 12/10/14
IV.C.9-15 – Board Rule 2300.10-2300.11
IV.C.9-16 – BOT agenda and minutes, 11/19/14 and 5/13/15
IV.C.9-17 – BOT ACCJC training certificates, 2012
IV.C.9-18 – Board Rule 2103
IV.C.9-19 – BOT Minutes 4/11/07
IV.C.9-20 – BOT Agenda 3/11/15
IV.C.9-21 – Board Rule 2102
IV.C.9-22 – Board Rule 21000

Standard IV.C.10.
Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board’s effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional
effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

The Board of Trustees consistently adheres to its self-evaluation policies. Board members routinely assess their practices, performance, and effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Board’s self-evaluation informs their goals, plans and training for the upcoming year.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. In 2007 the Board adopted Board Rule 2301.10, which requires the Board to assess its performance the preceding year, and establish annual goals, and report the results during a public session. Since then, the Board has regularly conducted an annual self-evaluation of its effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness, as well as setting goals which are in alignment with the District Strategic Plan. (IV.C.10-1 BR 2301.10)

b. The Board has regularly sought specialized expertise in conducting their self-evaluation. For the past two years, the Board contracted with Dr. Jose Leyba to assist in ensuring a comprehensive and consistent self-evaluation process, in alignment with ACCJC standards. (IV.C.10-2 Jose Leyba bio)

c. In May 2015, the Board conducted a leadership and planning session where they reviewed their plans for self-evaluation, along with ACCJC standards on Board leadership and governance, their previous (2014) self-assessment, and their proposed 2015 self-assessment instrument. (IV.C.10-3 BOT Agenda and minutes, 5/13/15); (IV.C.10-4 BOT Self-Evaluation2015 Plan of Action, 5/13/15)

d. Also in May 2015, Board members completed individual interviews with the consultant, where they candidly assessed the Board’s effectiveness. The Board’s interview questions were adapted from the Community College League of California’s publication, “Assessing Board Effectiveness.” (IV.C.10-5 2015 Self-Assessment Tool)

e. The Board conducted a facilitated self-evaluation at their June 2015 meeting. Topics included a summary of the Board’s individual interviews, along with a self-assessment of their internal practices and effectiveness in promoting academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Board also reviewed their progress in light of their 2014-2015 priorities and attainment of their 2013-2014 goals. Their individual self-assessments, group assessment, and data informed their plans for Board improvement and strategic initiatives and goals for 2015-2016 which included a focus on academic quality and institutional effectiveness. (IV.C.10-6 BOT agenda and minutes, handouts & PPT, 6/13/15)

f. The Board conducted a similar self-evaluation process with Dr. Leyba in 2014. Members evaluated their participation in Board training, their role in accreditation, adherence to their
policy-making role, and received training on accreditation process and delegation of policy implementation to the CEO/Chancellor. The Board has used qualified consultants in prior years to facilitate their self-evaluation, ensuring that they meet the requirements of the Board Rule and this standard. (IV.C.10-7 BOT minutes and handouts, 3/13/14); (IV.C.10-8 BOT minutes, 2/6/13 and 3/19/13); (IV.C.10-9 BOT Evaluation Comparison Summary Report 2012-2013, 2/2013); (IV.C.10-10 BOT Actionable Improvement Plan, 3/19/13); (IV.C.10-11 BOT minutes and handouts, 2/21/12); (IV.C.10-12 BOT agenda, minutes and handouts, 1/20/10)

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The Board’s self-evaluation process has facilitated a focus on appropriate roles and responsibilities in the policy-making and accreditation activities of the District; and in helping promote and sustain educational quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success. All Board members regularly participate in training, orientation, goal-setting, and self-evaluation activities, which increased their knowledge of appropriate engagement in policy-making and oversight of student success and educational quality outcomes.

The Board and Chancellor are committed to continuously improve the Board’s self-evaluation process to ensure the District achieves better outcomes in promoting and sustaining academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success. The District meets this Standard.

**Evaluation List for Standard IV.C.10**

IV.C.10-1 – Board Rule 2301.10  
IV.C.10-2 – Jose Leyba bio  
IV.C.10-3 – BOT agenda and minutes, 5/13/15  
IV.C.10-5 – BOT 2015 Self-Assessment Tool  
IV.C.10-6 – BOT agenda and minutes, handouts & PPT, 6/13/15  
IV.C.10-7 – BOT minutes and handouts, 3/13/14  
IV.C.10-8 – BOT minutes, 2/6/13 and 3/19/13  
IV.C.10-10 – BOT Actionable Improvement Plan, 3/19/13  
IV.C.10-11 – BOT agenda and minutes, 2/21/12  
IV.C.10-12 – BOT agenda, minutes and handouts, 1/20/10

**Standard IV.C.11.**

*The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of*
governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

The Los Angeles Community College District has clear policies and procedures which govern conflict of interest for Board members as well as employees. Board Rule 14000 spells out the Conflict of Interest Code for the District and the Board. Board members receive an initial orientation before taking office, updates throughout the year, and file a yearly conflict of interest statement. (IV.C.11-1 Board Rule 14000)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. Board rules articulate a Statement of Ethical Values and Code of Ethical Conduct, along with procedures for sanctioning board members who violate District rules and regulations and State or federal law. (IV.C.11-2 Board Rule 2300.10 – 2300.11)

b. Trustees receive certificates from the California Fair Political Practices Commission for conflict of interest training they complete every two years. Incoming Trustees are also trained on the District’s conflict of interest policy during orientation sessions (see Standard IV.C.9). (IV.C.11-3 Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2013); (IV.C.11-4 Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2015)

c. The LACCD’s electronic conflict of interest form (California Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests), ensures that there are no conflicts of interest on the Board. The District’s General Counsel is the lead entity responsible for ensuring Trustees complete forms as required. Completed conflict of interest forms are available to any member of the public during normal business hours of the Educational Services Center. (IV.C.11-5 Trustees Form 700)

d. Board members follow the code of ethics and conflict of interest policy by recusing themselves from Board discussion or abstaining from a Board vote where they have a documented conflict. (IV.C.11-6 BOT minutes, 12/13/14)

Analysis and Evaluation

The Board has a clearly articulated code of ethics and processes for sanctioning behavior that violates that code. Board members are required to electronically file conflict of interest forms, which remain on file in the Office of General Counsel. Board members are fully aware of their responsibilities and, to date, there have been no reported instances of violation by any Trustee or any sanctions discussed or imposed. A majority of the Board members have no employment, family ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence for Standard IV.C.11

IV.C.11-1 – Board Rule 14000
Standard IV.C.12.
The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEO to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

The Board of Trustees delegates full authority to the Chancellor, who in turn, has responsibility for oversight of District operations and the autonomy to make decisions without interference. Per Board rule, Trustees specifically agree to participate in the development of District policy and strategies, while respecting the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institution. Trustees pledge to avoid involvement in day-to-day operations.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. The Board “authorizes the Chancellor to adopt and implement administrative regulations when he/she finds regulations are necessary to implement existing Board Rules and/or a particular policy is needed which does not require specific Board authorization.” (IV.C.12-1 Board Rule 2902)

b. The Board delegates full responsibility to the Chancellor and recognizes “that the Chancellor is the Trustees’ sole employee; [pledging] to work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record.” (IV.C.12-2 Board Rule 2300.10)

c. The Board’s delegation of full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference is also evident in the Functional Area maps for the Board and for the Chancellor. The Board and Chancellor review their respective Functional Area maps on a regular basis, and update them as needed. (IV.C.12-3 Board Functional Area map 2015); (IV.C.12-4 Chancellor Functional Area map 2015)

d. To avoid any perception of interference, Board member inquiries are referred to the Chancellor and his designees for response. The Board office documents information requests in a memo to the Deputy Chancellor’s Office, which in turn, enters it into a tracking system. Responses are then provided to all Trustees via the Board letter packet sent one week prior to each Board meeting. (IV.C.12-5 BOT Info Request Tracking Document); (IV.C.12-6 Board letter packet 5/27/15)

e. In accordance with Chancellor’s Directive 122, the Board holds the Chancellor accountable for District operations through his/her job description, performance goals, and annual
evaluation (see Standard IV.C.3). The Board works with the Chancellor in setting annual performance goals guided by his/her job description and the District Strategic Plan. Chancellor evaluations have been conducted in accordance with District policies (see Standard IV.C.3). (IV.C.12-7 Chancellor Job Description, May 2013); (IV.C.12-8 Chancellor’s Directive 122); (IV.C.12-9 BOT closed agendas Chancellor evaluations 11/2014-6/2015)

Analysis and Evaluation

In 2012, the ACCJC recommended that Trustees improve their understanding of their policy role and the importance of following official channels of communication through the Chancellor. The Board then commenced a series of trainings (see Standard IV.C.9). In Spring 2013, after a follow-up visit to three LACCD colleges, the visiting team found the District to have fully addressed the recommendation, stating “…the Board of Trustees has provided clear evidence to show its commitment to ensuring that Board members understand their role as policy makers [and]…the importance of using official channels of communication through the Chancellor or assigned designee.” (IV.C.12-10 Spring 2013 Evaluation Team Report and June 2013 ACCJC letter)

The Chancellor and his executive team continue to support the training and focus of the Board on its policy-making role. The Board adheres to existing policies when evaluating the performance of the Chancellor and appropriately holds him, as their sole employee, accountable for all District operations. These practices have effectively empowered the Chancellor to manage the operations of the District and provide a structure by which the Board holds the Chancellor accountable. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence for Standard IV.C.12

IV.C.12-1 – Board Rule 2902
IV.C.12-2 – Board Rule 2300.10
IV.C.12-3 – Board Functional Area map 2015
IV.C.12-4 – Chancellor Functional Area map 2015
IV.C.12-5 – BOT Info Request Tracking Document
IV.C.12-6 – Board letter 5/27/15
IV.C.12-7 – Chancellor’s Job Description, May 2013
IV.C.12-8 – Chancellor’s Directive 122
IV.C.12-10 – Spring 2013 Evaluation Team Report and June 2013 ACCJC letter


The governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college’s accredited status, and supports through policy the college’s efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process.
The LACCD Board of Trustees has a strong, and ongoing, focus on accreditation. All Board members are made aware of Eligibility Requirements and accreditation Standards, processes, and requirements. The Board takes an active role in reviewing colleges’ accreditation reports and policy-making to support colleges’ efforts to improve and excel.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. To ensure that Board members are knowledgeable about the Eligibility Requirements, Commission policies, and all aspects of accreditation, Trustees receive annual training on accreditation, which includes a review of the ACCJC publication Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards, their role and responsibilities therein, and presentation on the accreditation status for each of the nine colleges. All Board members complete the ACCJC’s online Accreditation Basics training within three months of entering office (see Standard IV.C.9). (IV.C.13-1 BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 11/3/12; IV.C.13-2 BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 10/22/13; IV.C.13-3 BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 12/10/14)

b. The Board has had a consistent focus on accreditation. The Board supports through policy the colleges’ efforts to improve and excel. The Board created an Ad Hoc Committee on Accreditation in December 2013 in acknowledgement of the Board’s goal to have all colleges gain full reaffirmation of accreditation. (IV.C.13-4 need evidence Board Rule 6300); (IV.C.13-5 BOT minutes, 12/11/13, p. 4)

c. In order to engage and support faculty, staff and students at colleges undergoing accreditation, the Ad Hoc Committee on Accreditation visited Mission, Valley and Southwest colleges to meet with their accreditation teams and campus leadership to review and discuss their accreditation status and reporting activities in early 2014. In Fall 2014, the duties of the Ad Hoc Committee were formally incorporated into the charge of the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee. (IV.C.13-6 Accreditation Ad Hoc Committee agendas 2014)

d. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the IESS Committee held special committee meetings at the four colleges that were preparing Follow-Up or Midterm Reports. The IESS committee met with each college’s accreditation team, received a formal presentation on their accreditation report, and discussed accreditation-related issues. This committee has decided to utilize this same process for their review and approval of all colleges’ Self-Evaluation reports in the Fall 2015 semester. (IV.C.13-7 IESS Minutes, 12/9/14; IESS Minutes, 12/11/14; IESS minutes, 2/2/15)

e. The Board’s focus on accreditation is evident as it is a standing agenda item for the IESS Committee. Formal presentations and updates on colleges’ accreditation status and accreditation activities at the District level have been made regularly. In addition to monthly District-level updates, the Committee reviews and approves all college accreditation reports. (IV.C.13-8 IESS committee agendas for 2013-2015); (IV.C.13-9 IESS Accreditation
In 2013 and 2014, the Board committed funding to support the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) in their accreditation activities. These funds are dedicated to fund faculty accreditation coordinators, provide college-wide training, and offer technical support to help each college strengthen its accreditation infrastructure. (IV.C.13-15 IESS Minutes 8/21/13; IV.C.13-16 BOT minutes, 6/11/14)

each year the Board devotes one meeting to an accreditation update under the direction of the Committee of the Whole (COW). In April 2015, the Committee received an update on Districtwide accreditation activities and benchmarks achieved over the past year. Additionally, the EPIE division gave an accreditation update to the Board in January 2015. (IV.C.13-17 COW PPT, 4/29/15; IV.C.13-18 BOT Minutes, 8/22/12; IV.C.13-19 BOT Accreditation Update, 1/28/15)

In addition to its IESS committee, the Board reviews and approves all accreditation reports. (IV.C.13-20 BOT Agendas, 3/12/14, 2/11/15 and 3/11/15)

The Board participates in the evaluation of its roles and functions in the accreditation process during its annual self-evaluation (see Standard IV.C.10). This includes their review and approval of their updated Functional Area map and evaluation of their adherence to the stated roles and responsibilities. (IV.C.13-21 BOT Functional Area map, 9/17/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

Through active oversight by the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee, Board members have become more engaged in and aware of the accreditation process. Board members receive regular trainings and presentations on accreditation. The Board of Trustees reviews and approves all accreditation reports prior to their submission to the ACCJC. Decisions and discussion of policy frequently reference their impact in helping the colleges meet accreditation standards. The District meets this Standard.

Evaluation List for Standard IV.C.13

IV.C.13-1 – BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 11/3/12
IV.C.13-2 – BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 10/22/13
IV.C.13-3 – BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 12/10/14
IV.C.13-4 – Revised Board Rule 6300
IV.C.13-5 – BOT minutes, 12/11/13, p. 4
IV.C.13-6 – Accreditation Ad Hoc Committee agendas 2014
IV.C.13-7 – IESS committee minutes 12/9/14, 12/11/14, and 2/2/15
IV.C.13-8 – IESS committee agendas for 2013-2015
IV.C.13-9 – IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 11/19/14
IV.C.13-10 – IESS Accreditation Recap PPT, 2/25/15
IV.C.13-11 – IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 3/25/15
IV.C.13-12 – IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 4/29/15
IV.C.13-13 – IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 6/24/15
IV.C.13-14 – IESS committee minutes for 2014-2015
IV.C.13-15 – IESS Minutes, 8/21/13
IV.C.13-16 – BOT Minutes 6/11/14
IV.C.13-17 – COW PPT, 4/29/15
IV.C.13-18 – BOT Minutes, 8/22/12
IV.C.13-19 – BOT Accreditation Update PPT, 1/28/15
IV.C.13-20 – BOT Agendas, 3/12/14, 2/11/15 and 3/11/15
IV.C.13-21 – BOT Functional Area map, 9/17/15
Standard IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

Standard IV.D.1.
In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system CEO provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. Working with the colleges, the district/system CEO establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between colleges and the district/system.

The Chancellor engages employees from all nine colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) to work together towards educational excellence and integrity. Through his leadership and communication, the Chancellor has helped establish clear roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the District that support the effective operation of the colleges.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

CEO Leadership

a. The Chancellor demonstrates leadership in setting and communicating expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his participation in various faculty, staff, and student events at the nine colleges and the Educational Services Center. He shares his expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his columns in two District quarterly newsletters: Synergy and Accreditation 2016. Both newsletters are disseminated to District employees through email, posted on the District’s website and distributed at campus and District meetings. The Chancellor’s newsletter columns focus on his vision and expectations for educational excellence and integrity, support for effective college operations, and his expectation for all employees to engage in and support District and college accreditation activities. (IV.D.1-1 Synergy newsletters 2014-2015); (IV.D.1-2 District Accreditation newsletters, 2014-2015)

b. The Chancellor exhibits leadership at his regular monthly meetings with both the Chancellor’s Cabinet (senior District administrators and college presidents), as well as the Presidents Council, where he communicates his expectations, reviews and discusses roles, authority, and responsibility between colleges and the District, and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. In general, Cabinet meetings address operational effectiveness and alignment between the District office and the colleges, while the Presidents Council focuses on overall District policy and direction and specific college needs and support. (IV.D.1-3 Chancellor Cabinet agendas); (IV.D.1-4 Presidents Council agendas)

c. The Chancellor conducts regular retreats with the Cabinet to facilitate collaboration, foster leadership, and instill team building and mutual support. These retreats also provide the Chancellor with a forum to clearly communicate his expectations of educational excellence and integrity with his executive staff and college presidents. (IV.D.1-5 Chancellor retreat agendas, 2014)
d. The Chancellor communicates his expectations of educational excellence and integrity during the selection and evaluation process for college presidents. The Chancellor holds presidents to clearly articulated standards for student success, educational excellence, and financial sustainability. He emphasizes educational excellence and integrity in their annual evaluations, goal-setting for the upcoming year, and review of their self-evaluations (see Standard IV.D.4). The Chancellor assures support for effective operation of the colleges when meeting individually with each college president on a regular basis to discuss progress on their annual goals and any concerns, needs, and opportunities for their individual campus. (IV.D.1-6 WLAC College President Job Description, 2015)

e. The Chancellor communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity with faculty through regular consultation with the 10-member Executive Committee of the District Academic Senate (DAS). Meetings address academic and professional matters, including policy development, student preparation and success, District and college governance structures, and faculty professional development activities. The Chancellor also addresses educational excellence, integrity and support for college operations with faculty, staff and administrators through consistent attendance at Academic Senate’s annual summits. (IV.D.1-7 Agendas from DAS Consultation Meetings with Chancellor, 2014-2015); (IV.D.1-8 Agendas from DAS Summits, 2013-2015); (IV.D.1-9 DAS Academically Speaking newsletter, Fall 2015)

f. The Chancellor assures support for the effective operation of the colleges through his annual Budget Recommendations to the District Budget Committee and the Board of Trustees. His most recent actions ensured the distribution of $57.67M from the State Mandate Reimbursement Fund and alignment of expenditures with the District’s Strategic Plan goals. (IV.D.1-10 DBC Minutes, 7/15/15 & 8/13/14); (IV.D.1-11 Chancellor Budget Recs, 8/26/15)

g. In instances of presidential vacancies, the Chancellor meets with college faculty and staff leadership to discuss interim president options. Most recently, he met with West Los Angeles College leadership and accepted their recommendation for interim president, prioritizing college stability and support for effective operations in his decision-making process. (IV.D.1-12 WLAC Press Release announcing interim President, 6/25/15)
Clear Roles, Authority and Responsibility

h. The Los Angeles Community College District participated in the ACCJC’s multi-college pilot program in 1999, and has continuously worked since that time to ensure compliance with this standard. In 2009, ACCJC visiting teams agreed that the District made great strides in developing a functional map that delineates college and district roles, and encouraged it to further “…develop and implement methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district [as well as] widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those results as the basis for improvement.” In response, the District renewed its dedication to, and focuses on, these activities. (IV.D.1-13 ELAC Accreditation Evaluation Report, March 23-26, 2009, p. 6-7)

i. In October 2008, the Board of Trustees approved the first District/college Functional Area maps, which clarified the structure of District administrative offices and their relationship to the colleges, aligned District administrative functions with accreditation standards, and specified outcome measures appropriate to each function identified. (IV.D.1-14 LACCD District/College Functional Area map, 2008)

j. In March 2010, the Board of Trustees approved an initial Governance and Functions Handbook, which expanded upon the previous District/College Functional Area maps to more clearly define District and college responsibilities and authority along accreditation standards. This was the culmination of a two-year project led by the District Planning Committee (DPC), which engaged faculty, staff, administrators and student leaders in this update. During this process, all administrative units in the Educational Service Center (ESC) updated their earlier functional descriptions and outcomes. Over 50 Districtwide committee and council descriptions were also updated to a uniform standard. Functional Area maps were expanded to clarify policy formulation processes, roles and responsibilities of stakeholder groups, and the handbook evaluation process was defined. (IV.D.1-15 LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, 2010); (IV.D.1-16 Committee Description template); (IV.D.1-17 College governance handbook template)

k. In 2013, the 2010 Governance Handbook underwent an internal review by the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division to ensure it matched current processes, organizational charts, and personnel. As of August 2015, the Handbook is being updated under the guidance of the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the EPIE division. (IV.D.1-18 LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, 2013)

l. In Fall 2014, all ESC administrative units began a new program review process. Each of the eight administrative divisions developed unit plans and updated their unit descriptions and functional maps. Individual unit plans, along with measurable Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), replaced the previous District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) performance objectives (see Standard IV.D.2). Existing Functional Area maps were also reviewed and updated by the ESC administrative units. The content for District and college responsibilities is currently being reviewed by the colleges, the Executive Administrative Councils and other
stakeholders (see Standard IV.D.2). (IV.D.1-19 ESC 2014 Program Reviews); (IV.D.1-20 Draft Functional Area maps 2015)

m. With the endorsement of the Chancellor and support from the District’s Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) began reviewing and updating the District Governance and Functions Handbook in June 2014. With DPAC’s leadership, the handbook will be reviewed and approved by representatives from the nine colleges and the ESC and submitted to the Board of Trustees for review and approval during the Fall 2015 semester. (IV.D.1-21 LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, 2015)

n. In late 2009, the District began planning for a new Student Information System (SIS), currently scheduled to go live in Fall 2017. During the initial phase, faculty, staff, and students mapped over 275 business processes, in which the functions, roles, responsibilities and the division of labor between colleges and the ESC were clarified, and in some instances, redefined. Business processes continue to be updated and refined as the SIS project moves through its various implementation phases. (IV.D.1-22 SIS maps)

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The Chancellor communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity and support for effective college operations through regular meetings, electronic communications, college activities and faculty events across the District, and civic engagement throughout the region to bolster the goals and mission of the District.

The Chancellor and his executive team led the ESC’s revised program review processes, which resulted in updated Functional Area maps, clarification of District and the colleges’ roles and responsibilities, and identification of service gaps between college and District functions.

Update of the District’s Governance and Functions Handbook as part of the District’s regular review and planning cycle, will further strengthen its usefulness in providing clear roles, responsibilities, and authority for employees and stakeholders across the District. The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence List for Standard IV.D.1**

IV.D.1-1 – District newsletters 2014-2015  
IV.D.1-3 – Chancellor’s Cabinet agendas  
IV.D.1-4 – Presidents Council agendas, 2012-2015  
IV.D.1-5 – Chancellor cabinet retreat agendas, 2014  
IV.D.1-6 – WLAC college president Job Description, 2015  
IV.D.1-7 – Agendas from DAS Consultation Meetings with Chancellor, 2014-2015  
IV.D.1-8 – Agendas from DAS Summits, 2007-2015  
IV.D.1-9 – DAS Academically Speaking newsletter, Fall 2015
Standard IV.D.2.
The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.

During the District’s early years, operations of the District Office (now known as the Educational Services Center) were highly centralized, and many college decisions related to finance and budget, capital projects, hiring, payroll and contracts were made “downtown.” Operations were subsequently decentralized and functions delineated, and the District continues to evaluate these delineations on an ongoing basis.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. In 1998, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of partial administrative decentralization. Colleges were given autonomy and authority for local decision-making to streamline administrative processes, encourage innovation, and hold college decision-makers more accountable to the local communities they serve. Since that time, the District has continued to review and evaluate the delineation of responsibilities between the colleges and the Educational Services Center. (IV.D.2-1 1998 decentralization policy)

Delineation of Responsibilities and Functions

b. Functional Area maps detail the division of responsibilities and functions between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC), as well as Districtwide decision-making and planning (see Standard IV.D.1). The District developed its first functional maps in 2008, and they have been widely communicated and regularly updated since that time. In Fall 2014, the Chancellor directed all ESC units to review and update their Functional Area maps to
accurately reflect current processes, roles, and responsibilities as part of a comprehensive program review process (see Standard IV.D.1). Revised maps are currently under review by all colleges, the Executive Administrative Councils, and major stakeholders across the District. The Chancellor engages the college presidents and the cabinet in the discussion and review of the Functional Area maps. The Functional Area maps will be finalized in Fall 2015. (IV.D.2-2 District Functional Area maps, 2015); (IV.D.2-3 Functional Area map review request email)

**Effective and Adequate District Services**

c. The Chancellor directs the Educational Services Center staff to ensure the delivery of effective and adequate District services to support the colleges’ missions. Services are organized into the following units: (1) Office of the Deputy Chancellor; (2) Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness; (3) Economic and Workforce Development; (4) Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer; (5) Facilities Planning and Development; (6) Human Resources; (7) Office of the General Counsel; and (8) the Personnel Commission. (IV.D.2-4 2013 LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, p. 51-57)

- **The Office of the Deputy Chancellor** includes ADA training and compliance; Business Services, including operations, contracts, procurement and purchasing; Information Technology, including the District data center, system-wide applications, hardware and security, and Diversity Programs, which includes compliance and reporting.

- **Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE)** coordinates District-level strategic planning, accreditation, research, and attendance accounting reporting, as well as Districtwide educational and student services initiatives, maintains course and program databases, and supports the Student Trustee and the Students Affairs Committees.

- **Economic and Workforce Development** facilitates development of career technical education programs, works with regional businesses to identify training opportunities, collaborates with public and private agencies to secure funding, and keeps colleges informed of state and national issues affecting CTE programs.

- **Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer** serves as the financial advisor to the Board and the Chancellor. Budget Management and Analysis develops revenue projections, manages funding and allocations, and ensures college compliance and reporting. The Accounting Office is responsible for District accounting, fiscal reporting, accounts payable, payroll, and student financial aid administration. Internal Audit oversees internal controls and manages the LACCD Whistleblower hotline.

- **Facilities Planning and Development** is responsible for the long-term planning, management, and oversight of capital improvement and bond projects, as well as for working collaboratively with college administrators to identify creative, cost-effective solutions to facility challenges.
• **Human Resources** assists colleges with the recruitment and hiring of academic personnel, the hiring of classified staff, and managing employee performance and discipline. It also conducts collective bargaining, develops HR guides, administers the Wellness Program, and oversees staff development.

• **The Office of the General Counsel** provides legal services to the Board of Trustees and District employees, including: litigation, contracting, Conflict of Interest filings, and Board Rule and administrative regulations review. It also responds to Public Records Act requests.

• **The Personnel Commission** is responsible for establishing and maintaining a job and salary classification plan for the classified service; administering examinations and establishing eligibility lists, and conducting appeal hearings on administrative actions, including demotions, suspensions, and dismissals.

_Evaluation of District Services_

d. Beginning in 2008, each ESC service area unit evaluated its own District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) as part of unit planning. In Fall 2014, the Chancellor directed the Educational Services Center to implement a comprehensive program review to expand DOSOs into a data driven evaluation process in support of the colleges. (IV.D.2-5 DOSO evaluations, 2008-2009); (IV.D.2-6 DOSO evaluations 2011-2012)

e. Each unit participated in a series of workshops on conducting a program review, led by an external consultant. Units identified and documented their core services, then created projected outcomes. Resulting Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) were based on Districtwide needs and priorities, with clear links to district-level goals. The program review process requires each unit to consider its main contributions to the colleges’ missions, goals, effectiveness, and/or student achievement or learning. Simultaneously, the ESC moved towards adopting an online program review system, currently in use at two of the District’s colleges. (IV.D.2-7 Fall 2014 Accreditation Newsletter “ESC Begins Revitalized Program Review Cycle”); (IV.D.2-8 Program Review workshop agendas, 2014); (IV.D.2-9 Program Review Template, 2014)

f. An Educational Services Center user survey was created to solicit college user feedback in support of the program review process. Common questions were developed for all units, with individual units having the ability to customize supplemental questions specific to their college users. Over 21 user groups, including services managers, deans, directors, vice presidents, and presidents participated in the survey over a period of five weeks. (IV.D.2-10 2014 ESC Services Surveys)

g. As of this writing, all ESC divisions have completed one cycle of program review. Analysis of the ESC Services Survey was disaggregated and used to identify areas of strength and weakness. Units received feedback on the effectiveness of their services and suggestions for
improvement. Results also included comparison data between different units within the ESC in order to provide a baseline for overall effectiveness. Units with identified areas for improvement set in place plans to remediate their services and strengthen support to the colleges in achieving their missions. The Board received a presentation on the status of the ESC Program Review process in Spring 2015. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has since developed a program review manual for the ongoing implementation of program review at the ESC. (IV.D.2-11 2014 ESC Services Survey Analyses); (IV.D.2-12 Program Review Update PPT, 2/20/15); (IV.D.2-13 Draft ESC Program Review Manual, 10/1/15)

Allocation of Resources

h. The District revised its Budget Allocation policies in June 2012 and its Financial Accountability policies in October 2013. Together, these policies set standards for support of college educational mission and goals, providing a framework for them to meet the requirements of Standard III.D. Policies hold colleges accountable for meeting fiscal stability standards, while also allowing a framework within which colleges can request additional financial support in instances of situational deficits. There is a clear process whereby colleges can request debt deferment or additional funds, and self-assessments and detailed recovery plans are required before receiving approval of such resources. The District and Board continue to evaluate these policies (see Standard III.D.3) and revise them as needed to support college fiscal stability. (IV.D.2-14 Budget Allocation Mechanism, 2012); (IV.D.2-15 Financial Accountability Measures, 2013); (IV.D.2-16 ECDBC recommendation on LAHC deferral request, 6/10/15); (IV.D.2-17 LAHC Debt Referral Request PPT to BFC, 9/16/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

The District is comprised of nine individual colleges of vastly different sizes, needs and student populations. The Educational Services Center strives to continuously delineate its functions and operational responsibilities to support colleges in achieving their missions. Adequacy and effectiveness of District services are evaluated through program review and user satisfaction surveys. Through the implementation of its comprehensive program review process, the EPIE division discovered that its user surveys did not adequately evaluate the District and colleges’ adherence to their specified roles and functions. In response, questions related specifically to this issue will be included in the 2016-2017 cycle of the Districtwide governance and decision-making survey. Revisions to the program review system and assignment of specific staff will ensure ongoing evaluations are systematized and data driven, and that the results are used for integrated planning and the improvement of ESC services.

The District continues to evaluate its resource allocation and financial accountability policies to ensure colleges receive adequate support and are able to meet accreditation standards related to financial resources and stability. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard IV.D.2
Standard IV.D.3.
The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures.

The District has well-established resource allocation policies that support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and District. These policies are regularly evaluated. Under the leadership of the Chancellor, college presidents, administrators and faculty leaders work together to ensure effective control of expenditures and the financial sustainability of the colleges and District.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Allocation and Reallocation of Resources

a. The District Budget Committee (DBC) provides leadership on District-level budget policies. Membership includes all nine college presidents, the District Academic Senate, and collective bargaining unit representatives. Its charge is to: (1) formulate recommendations to the Chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District Strategic Plan; (2) review the District budget and make recommendations to the Chancellor, and (3) review quarterly District financial conditions. (IV.D.3-1 DBC webpage screenshot, 8/2015)

b. In 2007, the District instituted a budget allocation policy which paralleled the SB 361 State budget formula. Funds are distributed to the colleges on a credit and noncredit FTES basis, with an assessment to pay for centralized accounts, District services, and set-aside for contingency reserves. In an attempt at parity, districtwide assessments were changed from a percentage of college revenue, to a cost per FTES basis, and the small colleges (Harbor,
Mission, Southwest and West) received a differential to offset their proportionately-higher operational expenses. (IV.D.3-2 BOT Agenda, BF2, 2/7/07 SB 361 Budget Allocation Model)

c. In 2008, the Fiscal Policy and Review Committee (FPRC) was created to address ongoing college budget difficulties and to consider new approaches for improving their fiscal stability. The FPRC and the DBC reviewed their roles and, in Spring 2011, the FPRC was renamed the Executive Committee of the DBC (ECDBC). The charges for both committees were revised to ensure that budget planning policies were consistent with the District Strategic Plan. (IV.D.3-3 DBC minutes 5/18/11)

d. Also in 2011, the District undertook a full review of its budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayment. A review of other multi-college district budget models and policies was also conducted. The resulting recommendations were to adopt a model with a minimum base funding. The model had two phases:
- Phase I increased colleges’ basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs
- Phase II called for further study in the areas of identifying college needs (including M&O), providing funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, and ensuring colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services. (IV.D.3-4 ECDBC Budget Allocation Model Recommendation, Jan 2012)

e. The Board of Trustees adopted an updated Budget Allocation policy on June 13, 2012. An evaluation of the policy was completed in late 2014, and additional policy recommendations were forwarded. (IV.D.3-5 BOT Agenda, BF4, Budget Allocation model amendment, 6/13/12); (IV.D.3-6 District Budget Allocation Evaluation)

f. The Board adopted new District Financial Accountability policies on October 9, 2013 to ensure colleges operate efficiently. These policies called for early identification and resolution of operating deficits required each college to set aside a one percent reserve, and tied college presidents’ performance and evaluation to college budgeting and spending. The Board’s Budget and Finance Committee regularly monitors colleges’ costs per FTES and deficits. (IV.D.3-7 BOT agenda BF4, Financial Accountability Measures, 10/9/13); (IV.D.3-8 BFC agenda, minutes and handouts on Costs per FTES, 10/8/14)

g. The District’s adherence to the State-recommended minimum 5% reserve has ensured its continued fiscal sustainability. In June 2012, the Board’s Finance and Audit Committee (now known as the Budget and Finance Committee) directed the CFO to set aside a 5% general reserve and an additional 5% contingency reserve to ensure ongoing District and college operational support. (IV.D.3-9 FAC meeting minutes 6/13/12)

Effective Control Mechanisms
h. The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditures. Each month, enrollment updates and college monthly projections are reported (see Standard IV.D.1). The Chancellor and college presidents work together in effectively managing cash flow, income and expenditures responsibly to maintain fiscal stability. (IV.D.3-10 2014-15 Quarterly Projections)

i. College and District financial status is routinely reported to and reviewed by the Board of Trustees, along with college quarterly financial status reports, attendance accounting reports, and internal audit reports (see Standard III.D.5).

j. The District provides comprehensive budget and financial oversight, including an annual finance and budget report (CCFS-311), a final budget, an annual financial audit, a bond financial audit report, a performance audit of bond construction programs, year-end balance and open order reports, full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) reports and targets, enrollment projections, and year-to-year comparisons with enrollment targets (see Standard III.D.5).

k. Each college president is responsible for the management of his or her college’s budget and ensures appropriate processes for budget development and effective utilization of financial resources in support of his/her college’s mission (see Standard IV.D.2). (IV.D.3-7 BOT agenda, BF4, Financial Accountability Measures, 10/9/13)

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The District has a long history of financial solvency. Colleges follow standards of good practice that include the development of an annual financial plan, quarterly status reports, set-aside for reserves, and the obligation to maintain a balanced budget. Through its effective control of expenditures, the District has consistently ended the fiscal year with a positive balance. The higher levels of reserves have allowed the District to minimize the impact of cuts to college operations resulting from the State’s recent financial crisis. The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence List for Standard IV.D.3**

IV.D.3-1 – DBC webpage screenshot, August 2015  
IV.D.3-2 – BOT agenda, BF2, 2/7/07 SB 361 Budget Allocation Model  
IV.D.3-3 – DBC minutes 5/18/11  
IV.D.3-4 – ECDBC Budget Allocation Model Recommendation, Jan 2012  
IV.D.3-5 – BOT agenda, BF4, Budget Allocation model amendment, 6/13/12  
IV.D.3-6 – District Budget Allocation Evaluation  
IV.D.3-7 – BOT agenda, BF4, Financial Accountability Measures, 10/9/13  
IV.D.3-8 – BFC agenda, minutes and handouts on Costs per FTES, 10/8/14  
IV.D.3-9 – FAC minutes 6/13/12  
IV.D.3-10 – 2014-15 Quarterly Projections
The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO’s accountable for the operation of the colleges.

The Chancellor delegates full responsibility and authority to the college presidents and supports them in implementing District policies at their respective colleges. College presidents are held accountable for their college’s performance by the Chancellor, the Board, and the communities they serve.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. College presidents have full responsibility and authority to conduct their work without interference from the Chancellor (see Standard IV.C.3). College presidents have full authority in the selection and evaluation of their staff and management team. (IV.D.4-1 HR Guide R-110 Academic Administrator Selection, 7/31/15)

b. The framework for CEO accountability is established through annual goal-setting between the Chancellor and each college president. College presidents then complete a yearly self-evaluation based on their established goals. At least every three years (or sooner if requested), presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation, which includes an evaluation committee, peer input, and, if needed, recommendations for improvement. Unsatisfactory evaluations may result in suspension, reassignment, or dismissal. Evaluations are reviewed with the Board of Trustees in closed session. (IV.D.4-2 College president Self Evaluation packet); (IV.D.4-3 BOT agendas w/President evaluations, 2011-2014)

c. In October 2013, the Board adopted fiscal accountability measures which explicitly hold college presidents responsible to the Chancellor for their budgets, ensuring that they maintain “a balanced budget, as well as the efficient and effective utilization of financial resources.” These measures also require that the Chancellor “…review the college’s fiscal affairs and enrollment management practices as part of the college president’s annual performance evaluation…[and] report to the Board of Trustees any significant deficiencies and take corrective measures to resolve the deficiencies up to and including the possible reassignment or non-renewal of the college president’s contract.” (IV.D.4-4 BOT Agenda BF2, 10/9/13)

d. The role of the Chancellor, as well as that of the presidents and the levels of authority within, is clearly delineated in the LACCD Functional Area maps, which explicitly state “…the Chancellor bears responsibility and is fully accountable for all operations, programs, and services provided in the name of the district…The Chancellor delegates appropriate authority to the college presidents and holds them accountable for the operations and programs offered at District colleges.” Functional Area maps are regularly reviewed and updated, and published in the Governance and Functions Handbook and on the District website. (IV.D.4-5 Chancellor Functional Area map, 2015)
Analysis and Evaluation

The Chancellor delegates full authority and responsibility to the college presidents to implement District policies without interference. College presidents serve as the chief executives and educational leaders of their respective colleges. They ensure the quality and integrity of programs and services, accreditation status, and fiscal sustainability of their colleges. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard IV.D.4

IV.D.4-1 – HR Guide R-110 Academic Administrator Selection, 7/31/15
IV.D.4-2 – College president Self Evaluation packet
IV.D.4-3 – BOT agendas w/President evaluations, 2011-2014
IV.D.4-4 – BOT agenda BF2, 10/9/13
IV.D.4-5 – Chancellor Functional Area map, 2015

Standard IV.D.5.

District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.

College strategic plans are integrated with the District Strategic Plan (DSP), Vision 2017, through alignment of goals between the two. Colleges develop goals for their strategic and educational master plans during their internal planning process, and reconcile alignment with the District Strategic Plan on an annual basis. The structure of the DSP allows colleges to maintain autonomy and responsibility for implementing the goals and objectives of the District plan, based on their local conditions and institutional priorities. (IV.D.5-1 District Strategic Plan: Vision 2017, 2/6/13)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

District Strategic Plan, Planning Integration

a. LACCD has established district-level integrated processes for strategic, financial, facilities and technology planning. These processes provide a coherent framework for district-college planning integration with the goal of promoting student learning and achievement. The District’s Integrated Planning Manual is currently being updated by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the District’s Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division and will be reviewed and approved by the colleges and Board of Trustees in Fall 2015. (IV.D.5-2 LACCD Integrated Planning Manual, 2015)

b. DSP measures were developed for each college, and the District as a whole, to create a uniform methodology and data sources. Colleges compare their progress against the District as a whole using the most recent three year timeframe as the point of reference. Colleges assess progress and establish targets to advance both local and District objectives. Colleges’
annual assessments are reported to the Board of Trustees using a standard format, allowing for an apples-to-apples Districtwide discussion. (IV.D.5-3 college effectiveness report template); (IV.D.5-4 IESS cmte agenda on IE rpts)

c. College institutional effectiveness reports inform the Board of Trustees on the advancement of District goals which, in turn, informs the Board’s annual goal setting process and shapes future college and District planning priorities. The District Strategic Plan is reviewed at the mid-point of the planning cycle, and a final review is conducted in the last year of the cycle. (IV.D.5-5 BOT agenda, Annual Board Leadership & Planning Session, 8/19/15); (IV.D.5-6 DPAC agenda 6/26/15); (IV.D.5-7 DPAC agenda, 8/28/15)

d. The District Technology Plan created a framework of goals and a set of actions to guide Districtwide technology planning. The District Technology Implementation Plan established measures and prioritized deployment of technology solutions in consideration of available resources. The District Technology Plan promotes the integration of technology planning across the colleges by establishing a common framework for college technology planning. (IV.D.5-8 District Technology Strategic Plan, 3/9/11); (IV.D.5-9 District Technology Implementation Plan, 3/21/13)

e. District-college integration also occurs during operational planning for districtwide initiatives. Examples include joint marketing and recruitment activities, implementation of the Student Success and Support Program, Student Equity Plans, and the new student information system. These initiatives involve extensive college-district collaboration, coordination with centralized District service units, and interaction with an array of District-level committees. (IV.D.5-10 SSSP New DEC Svc Categories PPT, 2014); (IV.D.5-11 SSSP Counselor DEC Trng PPT, 2014); (IV.D.5-12 SSI Steering Committee Minutes, 8/22/14); (IV.D.5-13 SIS Fit-Gap agendas, 2013)

f. Planning is integrated with resource allocation at the District level through annual enrollment growth planning and the budget review process. The individual colleges, and the District as a whole, develop enrollment growth and budget projections and confer on a quarterly basis to reconcile and update enrollment, revenue, and cost projections. Updated projections are regularly reported to the District Budget Committee and the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee. This high-level linkage of enrollment planning and resource allocation provides a framework for the District budget process. (IV.D.5-14 Quarterly College FTES meetings, 2014-2015); (IV.D.5-15 Quarterly enrollment reports to DBC); (IV.D.5-16 Quarterly enrollment reports to BFC); (IV.D.5-17 Budget Allocation Model, 2012 amendment)

Planning Evaluation

g. Various mechanisms are used to evaluate the effectiveness of college-district integrated planning:
   - The Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey assesses budget development and resource allocation, enrollment management, and FTES and facilities planning (see Standard IV.D.7).
• District-level planning and policy committees assess their effectiveness through an annual committee self-evaluation process (see Standard IV.D.1).
• The ESC Program Review process assesses performance and outcomes through an annual User Survey and information specific to each service unit (see Standard IV.D.2).
• Evaluation of District-level plans includes both an analysis of plan outcomes and a review of plan currency, relevancy, and alignment with external accountability initiatives; e.g. the Student Success Scorecard and the Statewide Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative. (IV.D.5-18 DPAC agendas, June-Aug 2015); (IV.D.5-19 BOT Agenda, Student Success Scorecard presentation, 9/2/15); (IV.D.5-20 IEPI 2015-16 Goals Framework, 5/27/15)

Evaluation and Analysis

The District has established mechanisms for integrated District-level strategic and operational plans. This integration involves collaboration and cooperation between colleges, the ESC service units, and District-level shared governance and administrative committees. Assessment mechanisms include direct assessment of governance and decision-making, governance committee self-evaluation, ESC program review, and review of District-level plans.

Even with the institutionalization of these processes, the size and complexity of the LACCD presents challenges to integrated planning and evaluation. Self-examination has revealed gaps in adherence to evaluation timelines and the need for more systematic and consistent evaluation processes and alignment across plans. The District, primarily through its Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division, continues to work on strengthening and expanding these mechanisms to improve the effectiveness of District-college integrated planning in promoting student learning and achievements.

To this end, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee has revised and strengthened its charter and has undertaken a review of all governance evaluations, as well as mid-term review of the District Strategic Plan. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has created an integrated planning manual for Districtwide plans with timelines and timeframes that set a synchronized reporting cycle. The updated evaluation and reporting framework will be institutionalized in the District Governance and Functions Handbook, codifying commitment to more coordinated planning on a districtwide basis. The District meets this Standard.

Evidence List for Standard IV.D.5

IV.D.5-3 – College Effectiveness Report template
IV.D.5-4 – IESS Committee agendas on IE report approval, 2012-2015
IV.D.5-5 – BOT agenda, Annual Board Leadership & Planning Session, 8/19/15
IV.D.5-6 – DPAC agenda, 6/26/15
IV.D.5-7 – DPAC agenda, 8/28/15
IV.D.5-8 – District Technology Strategic Plan, 3/9/11
Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.

The District has numerous councils and committees which meet regularly to share best practices and to ensure an effective flow of information between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC). Additionally, a number of standing monthly reports and updates are sent electronically to established District employee list serves.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. In total, the District has 46 districtwide councils, committees, and consultative bodies in which District and college administrative staff, faculty, classified staff, and students regularly participate. All councils and committees maintain agendas and meeting summaries/minutes on either the District website (public) or on the District intranet. (IV.D.6-1 Screenshot of District Intranet of Councils and Committees)

b. Seven Districtwide Executive Administrative Councils meet monthly: (1) Chancellor’s Cabinet, (2) Council of Academic Affairs, (3) Council of Student Services, (4) District Administrative Council, (5) Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC), (6) Human Resources Council; and (7) the Sheriff’s Oversight Committee. (IV.D.6-2 Districtwide Executive Administrative Councils 2015 update)

c. The Councils of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and the District Administrative Council are responsible for the review and study of districtwide instructional, student services, and administrative operational and programmatic issues. Executive Administrative Council members are predominantly senior ESC administrators, college presidents and college vice presidents. All councils report to either the Chancellor directly or to the Chancellor’s Cabinet. Meeting agendas and minutes are distributed to Council members in

IV.D.5-9 – District Technology Implementation Plan, March, 3/21/13
IV.D.5-10 – SSSP new DEC service categories PowerPoint, 2014
IV.D.5-11 – SSSP Counselor Training PowerPoint, 2014
IV.D.5-12 – SSI Steering Committee Minutes, 8/22/14
IV.D.5-13 – SIS Fit-Gap agendas, 2013
IV.D.5-14 – Quarterly College FTES meetings, 2014-2015
IV.D.5-15 – Quarterly enrollment report to DBC, 5/20/15
IV.D.5-16 – Quarterly enrollment report to BFC, 9/16/15
IV.D.5-17 – Budget Allocation Model, 2012 amendment
IV.D.5-18 – DPAC minutes, June-Aug 2015
IV.D.5-19 – BOT Agenda 9/2/15
advance of meetings. Meeting schedules are set each July for the upcoming year, and generally rotate between colleges and the ESC. (IV.D.6-3 Chancellor’s Directive 70)

d. **Four District-level Governance Committees** meet monthly: (1) District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC); (2) District Budget Committee (DBC); (3) Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC); and (4) the Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC). Committee members encompass a broad range of college faculty, college researchers, and college deans, with representatives from the unions, college presidents, college vice presidents, and ESC senior administrators. These committees typically consult with one or more Executive Administrative Council and report to either the Chancellor or to the Chancellor’s Cabinet. (IV.D.6-4 District-level Governance committee 2015 update)

e. In 2013, the governance committees agreed to a common format for their webpages. Each committee’s webpage contains a brief description of its function, committee charge, who it reports to, who it consults with, chairs, membership, meeting information, and resources. Results of the District-wide Governance Committee Self Evaluation as well as meeting agendas, minutes, and resource documents are posted on the webpage, which is accessible to the public. (IV.D.6-5 District-level Governance Committee webpage screenshot)

c. **Sixteen Operational Committees** meet monthly, or on a per-semester basis. These Committees are structured by subject/function area and coordinate with one of the Executive Administrative management councils. Committee members are largely faculty, program directors, researchers, and college deans, with representatives from the three Executive Administrative management councils and ESC senior administrative staff. Meeting agendas and minutes are emailed to committee members in advance of each meeting. (IV.D.6-6 District Coordinating Committees 2015 update); (IV.D-7 Email report to list serve, 2015)

d. **Five Academic Initiative Committees** coordinate Districtwide academic programs. These committees are primarily led by faculty, but also include administrators and classified staff. These committees focus on broader goals in various areas, including labor issues, articulation, transfer, and student success. (IV.D-8 District Academic Initiative Committees, 2015 update)

e. Information Technology maintains 78 active list serves. These list serves include the Districtwide consultative bodies, administrative councils, and operational committees as well as subject-specific groups such as articulation officers, curriculum chairs, counselors, and IT managers. Each list serve has a coordinator/owner charged with maintaining an accurate list of members. (IV.D.6-9 District List serve list)

f. In accordance with the Brown Act, all agendas and informational documents for Board of Trustee meetings are posted in the lobby at the ESC and on the District website. They are also distributed electronically to college presidents, college vice presidents, college and the
District Academic Senate presidents, and bargaining unit representatives. (IV.D.6-10 sample BOT agenda email)

g. Policy changes are communicated by the Office of General Counsel (OGC), which disseminates memos informing campuses and constituency groups of approved changes to Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. These updates are also posted on the District’s website. (IV.D.6-11 OGC Board Rule & Admin Reg Revision Notices, July-August 2015)

h. The Chancellor, Board of Trustees, and select ESC divisions and programs issue regular bulletins and newsletters, disseminating information on programs, accreditation, budget updates, success stories, and employee benefits. Additionally, the District Student Information System (SIS) project team has conducted forums at each college, informing all employees about the development and roll-out of the District’s new student records system. (IV.D.6-12 LACCD newsletters); (IV.D.6-13 Chancellor bulletins); (IV.D.6-14 Accreditation newsletters); (IV.D.6-15 Diversity newsletters); (IV.D.6-16 SIS newsletters); (IV.D.6-17 Wellness newsletters); (IV.D.6-18 Bond Program newsletters); (IV.D.6-19 SIS forum PowerPoint)

i. The Chancellor keeps the Board of Trustees, college presidents, and senior administrators abreast of Trustee matters, college/District updates and activities, legislative/public affairs updates, and community events through his weekly reports. Items often include updates on Chancellor and Board actions regarding college operations and stability. (IV.D.6-20 Chancellor weekly email updates)

j. The District Academic Senate (DAS) represents the faculty of the District in all academic and professional matters. In this capacity, the President and Executive Committee regularly inform faculty of District policy discussions and decisions related to educational quality, student achievement, and the effective operation of colleges. (IV.D.6-21 DAS Communication, 2014-15)

k. In 2011, District Information Technology (IT) undertook a complete redesign of the District website. The updated website, which allows each division/unit in the ESC to manage its own content, launched in Fall 2012. In 2013, the District updated its public interface and in December 2014, the District upgraded its internal software systems to better support the online needs of the District. Creation of web links to Board, committee, council, and program information has improved the public’s and District employees’ access to information about the District. (IV.D.6-22 Web redesign meeting, 10/13/11)

Analysis and Evaluation

The District ensures regular communication with the colleges and front-line employees through its committees and councils, websites, list serves, newsletters and bulletins, and email. Meeting agendas and minutes are posted online or distributed electronically. The District’s revamped
website has facilitated easier access for employees to maintain, and for the public to access, District and college information.

The District’s sheer size and volume of activity offers challenges to maintaining consistent engagement and communication with employees and stakeholders. While the District has improved its access to information and regular communications, it continues to look for ways to improve efforts in this area. The launch of the District’s new intranet site, currently scheduled for December 2015, is anticipated to improve employee access to ESC divisions, units, and services.

In September 2015, District Educational Program and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) staff and District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) members co-presented a workshop at the annual DAS Summit. The workshop addressed districtwide communication and discussed data from recent governance surveys related to communications. A facilitated discussion followed, with participants brainstorming communication strategies which will be reviewed by DPAC in upcoming meetings. The District meets this Standard. (IV.D.5-23 Districtwide Communication PPT, 9/25/15)

**Evidence List for Standard IV.D.6**

IV.D.6-1 – Screenshot of District Intranet of Councils and Committees
IV.D.6-2 – Districtwide Executive Administrative Councils 2015 draft update
IV.D.6-3 – Chancellor’s Directive 70, 8/30/94
IV.D.6-4 – District-level Governance committee 2015 update
IV.D.6-5 – District-level Governance committee webpage screenshot
IV.D.6.6 – District Coordinating Committees 2015 update
IV.D.6-7 – Email report to list serve, 2015
IV.D.6-8 – District Academic Initiative Committees, 2015 update
IV.D.6-9 – District List serve list
IV.D.6-10 – Sample BOT agenda email
IV.D.6-11 – OGC Board Rule and Admin Regs Revision Notices, July-August 2015
IV.D.6-12 – LACCD newsletters
IV.D.6-13 – Chancellor Bulletins
IV.D.6-14 – Accreditation newsletters
IV.D.6-15 – Diversity newsletters
IV.D.6-16 – SIS newsletters
IV.D.6-17 – Benefits and wellness newsletters
IV.D.6-18 – Bond Program newsletters
IV.D.6-19 – SIS forum PowerPoints
IV.D.6-20 – Chancellor weekly email updates
IV.D.6-21 – DAS Communication, 2014-15
IV.D.6-22 – Web redesign meeting, 10/13/11
IV.D.6-23 – Districtwide Communication PPT, 9/25/15

**Standard IV.D.7.**
The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

The District, under the guidance of the Chancellor, regularly evaluates the effectiveness of District/college role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes. Based on recommendations made by the ACCJC in 2009, the District Planning committee (DPC) implemented a cyclical process for system-level evaluation and improvement. The District institutionalized this cycle and continues to review and revise, processes in support of institutional effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Governance and Decision-Making Assessment, Effectiveness and Communication

a. In Fall 2009, the District Planning Committee (now the District Planning and Accreditation Committee) designed and administered a District governance survey. This assessment was undertaken in response to recommendations received during the Spring 2009 accreditation visits at East Los Angeles, Los Angeles City, and Los Angeles Trade-Technical Colleges, and resulted in action items for continuous improvement of District/college role delineation. (IV.D.7-1 2009 District Governance Survey Tool); (IV.D.7-2 2010 District Governance Assessment Report, 2/26/10)

b. The District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Survey continues to be administered on a two-year cycle. Survey participants evaluate the quality of District-level governance in the following areas:

- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the roles played by stakeholder groups, including administration, District Academic Senate, collective bargaining groups, and Associated Students organizations;
- Effectiveness of district-level decision-making processes in relation to five primary governance areas: budget and resource allocation, enrollment management, strategic planning and goals setting, bond program oversight, and employee benefits;
- Quality of district-level decision making (e.g., the extent to which decisions are based on data and are effectively communicated, implemented, and assessed), and
- Overall assessment of administrative and Board support of participatory governance as well as the effectiveness of districtwide decision making in relation to the District’s stated mission. (IV.D.7-3 2012 District Governance Survey Tool and Results); (IV.D.7-4 2015 District Governance Survey Tool)

c. The District’s Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has conducted surveys, analyzed recurring themes, disseminated and discussed results, and used the results to plan improvements. Challenges in implementing improvement plans occurred, and the IE unit has restarted its
survey and evaluation cycle. The unit recently completed current-year survey results and a comparative analysis of 2010, 2012 and 2014 survey results. Results were reviewed by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and plans to strengthen the survey tools and the development and implementation of improvement plans are now part of DPAC’s 2015-2016 work plan. These assessment reports have been posted online and will be reported to the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee in Fall 2015 and used to inform recommendations for District improvement. (IV.D.7-5 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Comparison Report for 2010, 2012, 2014, 8/28/15); (IV.D.7-6 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Analysis, 8/19/15); (IV.D.7-7 2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Report by College and Analysis by Role, 8/28/15); (IV.D.7-8 DPAC 2015-16 Work Plan, 8/28/15)

d. In 2009, DPAC, with assistance from the IE unit, established an annual Committee Self-Evaluation process for all District governance committees. This common self-assessment documents each committee’s accomplishments, challenges, and areas for improvement over the past year. Results of the assessment are reviewed by each respective committee and serve as the basis for changes and improvements to Committee function. Through their 2015-2016 work plan, DPAC reaffirmed their responsibility to ensure self-evaluations are conducted by District governance committees, results are posted online, and that they are used to inform committees’ work plans. (IV.D.7-9 Districtwide Committee Self-Evaluation form); (IV.D.7-10 DBC self-evaluation 2012-2013, 6/30/13; 2013-2014, 6/30/14); (IV.D.7-11 DPAC self-evaluation 2012-2013, 10/5/13; 2013-2014, 2/27/15); (IV.D.7-12 JLMBC self-evaluation 2011-12, 11/20/12; 2012-13, 7/9/13; 2013-14, 10/16/14); (IV.D.7-13 TPCC self-evaluation 2011-2015, 8/2015)

e. Role delineations are evaluated during the regular review of Functional Area maps and revisions are made based on input from governance committee members, governance surveys, ESC administrative units, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and college stakeholders. Functional Area maps were expanded and revised in 2015, and are currently under review prior to finalization (see Standard IV.D.1 and IV.D.2).

f. The District Governance and Functions Handbook is regularly reviewed and updated by District stakeholders under the coordination of the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC). A section of the Handbook describes all districtwide councils, committees, and consultative bodies. These entities were first formalized in 1994 by Chancellor’s Directive (CD) 70: Districtwide Internal Management Consultation Process. Updates to CD 70, and its related committee/council structure, committee/council charge, membership, meeting schedule, leadership and reporting structure are underway as of Fall 2015. (IV.D.7-14 Updated District Council and Committee list, 9/2/15)

Analysis and Evaluation

The District has processes to regularly evaluate district/system and college role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes. It has developed mechanisms for wide
communication of the results of these evaluations. However, the District as a whole has faced challenges in the evaluation process.

Thorough self-evaluation led the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit to discover that some evaluation cycles were off-track and results had not been systematically disseminated. The unit is currently updating governance survey and committee self-assessment instruments and integrating these evaluations into the District Effectiveness Cycle (see LACCD Integrated Planning Manual). (IV.D.7-15 Governance Evaluation Timeline, 8/27/15); (IV.D.5-2 LACCD Integrated Planning Manual)

The IE unit reported these findings and activities to DPAC, which, through its own self-examination and goal-setting process, undertook development of a comprehensive, and consistent, evaluation framework as part of its 2015-16 work plan. Adherence to the work plan will be ensured through the Committee’s expanded oversight role, as reflected in its revised charter, and by assigning a specific ESC staff member to maintain District governance committee websites. The District meets this Standard. (IV.D.7-8 DPAC 2015-16 Work Plan, 8/28/15); (IV.D.7-16 Updated DPAC Charter, 6/22/15)

**Evidence List for Standard IV.D.7**

IV.D.7-1 – 2009 District Governance Survey Tool  
IV.D.7-2 – 2010 District Governance Assessment Report, 2/26/10  
IV.D.7-3 – 2012 District Governance Survey Tool and Results  
IV.D.7-4 – 2015 District Governance Survey Tool  
IV.D.7-6 – 2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Analysis, 8/19/15  
IV.D.7-7 – 2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Report by College and Analysis by Role, 8/28/15  
IV.D.7-8 – DPAC 2015-2016 Work Plan, 8/28/15  
IV.D.7-9 – Districtwide Committee Self-Evaluation form  
IV.D.7-10 – DBC self-evaluation 2012-2014  
IV.D.7-11 – DPAC self-evaluation 2012-2014  
IV.D.7-12 – JLMBC self-evaluation 2011-2012  
IV.D.7-13 – TPCC self-evaluation 2011-2012, 7/19/12  
IV.D.7-14 – Updated District Council and Committee list, 9/2/15  
IV.D.7-15 – Governance Evaluation Timeline, 8/27/15  
IV.D.7-16 – Updated DPAC Charter, 6/22/15
VIII. Quality Focus Essay

A summary of all action plans is listed in Section IX: Changes and Plans Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process. Action plans are divided into those that can be completed short-term using existing processes and procedures (referred to in the narrative as an “Action Plan”), or those that required long-term change, development, and expansion of existing processes and procedures (referred to in the narrative as a “Quality Focus Essay Plan”). A review of those action plans that required long-term solutions resulted in the development of two multi-year action projects that are of critical importance to the College mission, and that will help the College meet its institution-set standards and targets:

(1) Access: Improve enrollment management through a goal-driven and strategy-driven marketing, recruiting, and retention plan

(2) Success: Decrease the average time it takes students to complete awards by improving learner-centered pathways to help students achieve their educational and career goals

These two action projects will focus College resources on action plans the College believes are most likely to positively impact student achievement, student learning, and realization of the institutional mission. The College’s self evaluation of its integrated planning process shows that it allows for an accurate assessment of whether the College is meeting its mission (Standard I.A.3), that it is based on realistic expectations for student achievement (Standard I.B.3), is data-driven (Standard I.B.4), is communicated to and understood by College constituencies (Standard I.B.8), and has resulted in meaningful improvements to programs and services (Standard I.B.9). The two action projects will utilize the established integrated planning process, which the College believes is one of its major strengths.

**Action Project #1:**

**Access: Effective Enrollment Management**

I. Identification of project

Effective enrollment management will enable the College to better realize its mission of empowering students to achieve their educational and career goals by increasing access and success through its transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills programs. Enrollment management is of critical importance to the long-term financial health of the College, as revenue is tied to enrollments. Given that only 18 percent of students at the College are under 20 years old (Annual College Profile 2014), emphasis must be placed on marketing and increasing participation rates of area high school graduates.

In 2013-14, 92.8 percent of the college budget was spent on certificated and classified salaries, and employee benefits. In 2014-15, this exceeded 93 percent. To address this issue, the College has long-term plans to increase income through more efficient enrollment management (Educational and Strategic Master Plan 2014-2020, Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1) and to reduce general fund staffing costs (2015-2020 Human Resources Plan, Goal #1). An increase in
discretionary funds and improved efficiency in staffing expenditures will allow the College to improve solvency by reducing the percentage of general funds spent on salary and benefits to the District average of 90.9 percent [review this # with Anil]. Based on current budgets, the impact to the College budget would be over $1 million annually.

Through the Self Evaluation, the College identified a number of areas where improvements or changes could impact enrollment management. The action project as a whole will lead to increased enrollments, which will increase discretionary funds, improve financial stability, and allow the College to better support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness (Standard III.D.1). Once the action project is institutionalized, the College will have a new set of procedures that will provide long-term financial stability (Standard III.D.2).

A. Connection to Self Evaluation

The action project of improving enrollment management through a marketing, recruiting, and retention plan came out of the institutional self evaluation.

The first objective in support of the goal is to meet enrollment targets by utilizing an effective marketing campaign. Through the self evaluation, the College recognizes it must take steps to meet its institution-set standard for full-time equivalent student enrollment (Section II. Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards). The College is lacking a Strategic Marketing Plan (Standard I.B.9) and needs to better market its strengths, and also needs to more clearly market its programs (Standard I.C.1) to increase enrollments.

The second objective in support of the goal is to increase participation rates of feeder high school graduates. The objective resulted from the recognition that the College needs to more effectively utilize student recruitment services (Standard I.C.1) and develop data (Standard I.B.4) to better understand the demographics of students at feeder high schools. To do so, the College will need to create additional work groups to support its existing governance and decision-making process (Standard IV.A.7), expand programs that will culminate in student attainment of learning outcomes and program achievement (Standard II.A.1), and develop additional planning documents (Standard I.B.9) including an Enrollment Management Plan.

The third objective, to increase persistence rate, resulted from the recognition that the College needs to develop new methods for evaluating the quality of its student support services (Standard II.C.1) and to identify and assess learning support outcomes and provide appropriate support services so students can better achieve those outcomes (Standard II.C.2), especially for at-risk students. The College recognized it needs to communicate more effectively to its enrolled students at all stages of their studies, especially using social media (Standard II.C.3). The College also recognized that it needs to develop additional planning activities (Standard I.B.9) in order to fully implement its matriculation plan.

The fourth objective in support of the goal is to improve institutional effectiveness to directly support the College in meeting its enrollment management targets. The objective came out of the
recognition that the College needs to meet its institution-set standard for full-time equivalent student enrollment (Section II. Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards), improve short-term planning toward long-term goals (Standard I.B.9), provide software and training (Standards III.C.1, III.C.4) to directly support employees in improving enrollment management, and expand the governance and decision-making process (Standard IV.A.7) as a result of the additional work required to meet the goal.

B. Use of Data

The action project is a result of an ongoing college wide analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. To address the question of why the College has been unable to meet its enrollment targets, the Enrollment Management Team has continually reviewed enrollment trends; survey results (why students drop during the spring semester, District student survey, campus climate survey); and the results of comprehensive and annual program review including class fill rates, average class sizes, and space utilization. Several years of campus climate surveys indicate the College continues to be concerned with custodial services, facilities maintenance, replacement of equipment, and modernization of technology (Standards III.A.1, III.B.1, III.C.1). These concerns are likely mitigated factors impacting enrollment. These concerns could be addressed through the increase in discretionary funds from increased enrollments.

The College level planning cycle provides a data based framework for planning to increase access measures including enrollment, course fill rate, average section size; and success measures including course completion, persistence, and number of degrees, certificates, and transfers (Section II.B: Institution-Set Standards). The program review cycle allows for the same type of analysis at the unit level. Through the SSSP, the College reviews the rates at which students are matriculating (number of educational plans, counseling sessions, and Math and English assessments). Through the Student Equity Plan the College reviews disproportionate impact. In the writing of the 2015-2020 Distance Education Plan the College considered the percentage of courses offered via DE and the uneven enrollment and course completion rates when compared to traditional classes.

II. Goal

Goal 1: Los Angeles City College will realize goal-driven and strategy-driven marketing, recruiting, and retention initiatives to enable the College to better realize its mission of empowering students to achieve their educational and career goals.
III. Objectives, Action Plans, Responsible Parties, Timeline, Resources, Outcomes

**Objective 1.1:** Meet enrollment targets by utilizing an effective marketing campaign

**Measure 1.1:** Meet both the minimum standard and aspirational target of Institution-Set Standard Performance Measure #1: FTES (See Section I.B: Institution-Set Minimum Standards and Aspirational Targets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 1.1</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Develop a Strategic Marketing Plan</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee, Marketing Committee, Enrollment Management Team</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Strategic Marketing Plan with specific action plans for 2017-18 and 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Update the College website</td>
<td>College webmaster, IT Director, Senior Staff</td>
<td>Fall 2015: Hire webmaster and external web development firm</td>
<td>Hire a college webmaster and external web development firm</td>
<td>Functional, interactive website with promotional capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2016: Updated website to go live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2016: Begin surveying incoming students on why they decided to attend the College; begin monitoring website traffic by semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Define and promote points of pride and areas of distinction</td>
<td>Marketing Committee</td>
<td>Complete and institutionalize “Did You Know” campaign by fall 2015</td>
<td>Check with marketing committee on how they plan to use the campaign</td>
<td>Check with marketing committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plans for Objective 1.1</td>
<td>Responsible Party/Committee</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Required Resources</td>
<td>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Promote signature and under-enrolled academic programs</td>
<td>EPPIC, Marketing Committee</td>
<td>2016-17: Conduct program demand/capacity study</td>
<td>Retain an external marketing firm to conduct the study</td>
<td>Elimination of non-viable programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017: Identification of signature programs, Identification of viable under-enrolled programs.</td>
<td>Marketing materials</td>
<td>Increased enrollments in under-enrolled programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-18: Viability studies on programs that are under-enrolled and potentially not viable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased capacity of high-demand programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-18: Creation of marketing materials highlighting signature programs and viable under-enrolled programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Increase marketing to area high schools</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Marketing Committee</td>
<td>Spring 2016: Identify college participation rates</td>
<td>Marketing materials</td>
<td>Marketing to additional area high schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2016: Create and distribute marketing materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased enrollments from area high schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-17: Create program specific advertising based on area high school demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.2:** Increase participation rates of area high school graduates  
**Measure 1.2:** Increase participation rates to 25%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 1.2</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Produce data to inform recruiting, including student satisfaction, price sensitivity, and academic program demand analysis (see 1.1.4)</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data to be used for enrollment management planning and decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards alignment: I.B.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Develop an enrollment management taskforce to develop and monitor recruitment</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Team</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of a enrollment management taskforce to implement College enrollment management policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards alignment: IV.A.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 Develop and support an online AA degree that a cohort of students can complete in two years</td>
<td>Distance Education Committee, Academic Senate, Marketing Committee, Student Services</td>
<td>Spring 2016: Request approval of additional DE courses Fall 2016: Develop marketing campaign Spring 2017: Initial pilot cohort of 100 students; hire Online Director as necessary; ensure availability of learning support services Fall 2017: Expand online cohort to 150 students</td>
<td>Marketing materials Hire an Online Director</td>
<td>Ability to offer an AA degree fully online Increased online enrollment Provide online students all learning support services as offered to traditional students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards alignment: II.A.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4 Revise and expand the</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Team</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>A comprehensive Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plans for Objective 1.3</td>
<td>Responsible Party/Committee</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Required Resources</td>
<td>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.1</strong> Assess student services to determine ways to be more student centered and welcoming</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Student Services, COMPASS, Staff and Organizational Development Committee</td>
<td>Fall 2016: Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A College Retention Plan based on an assessment of student services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2017: Write plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased student satisfaction with College support services (surveys, focus groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2017: Offering of professional development activities directly related to interacting with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.2</strong> Identify and support at-risk students</td>
<td>Student Services, Staff and Organizational Development</td>
<td>2016-17: Improve use of Early Alert program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development to effectively use of Early Alert to improve student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017: Provide expanded support services (academic preparation, financial aid, motivation, behavioral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.3</strong> Increase communication with enrolled students, especially through social media</td>
<td>Admissions and Records, IT</td>
<td>2016-17: Identify momentum points and develop targeted interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular communication with students at each stage of the enrollment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2017: Implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.3:** Increase persistence rates

**Measure 1.3:** Meet both the minimum standard and aspirational target of Institution-Set Standard Performance Measure #3: Persistence (See Section I.B: Institution-Set Minimum Standards and Aspirational Targets)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 1.3</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>automated system of communicating with students 2018-19: Dedicated administrator with oversight of retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.4:** Improve institutional effectiveness to support meeting enrollment management targets  
**Measure 1.4:** Meet both the minimum standard and aspirational target of Institution-Set Standard Performance Measure #1: FTES (See Section I.B: Institution-Set Minimum Standards and Aspirational Targets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 1.4</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1 Develop 30, 60, and 90 day “Just Do It” plans towards completion of the six-year goal</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Task Force; Enrollment Management Team</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Implementation of short-term enrollment management plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standards alignment: I.B.9*

| 1.4.2 Utilize room scheduling software | Senior Staff | Spring 2016 | Software | More efficient room scheduling  

*Standards alignment: III.C.1, III.C.4*

| 1.4.3 Consider the long-term relationship and reporting structure of the new enrollment management task force and the Enrollment Management Team | Enrollment Management Team, Strategic Planning Committee | 2018-19 | Software | Integration of enrollment management committee(s) into the formal committee reporting structure |

*Standards alignment: IV.A.7*
IV. Assessment: Continuous Improvement

The action project is designed to take six years, at which point the processes should be institutionalized. The next institutional self evaluation will occur in seven years, and the College will use the seventh year to develop a new quality focus essay action project.

Assessment of the action project will occur annually using the established integrated planning cycle, in the same way the College currently reviews its Educational and Strategic Master Plan (Standard I.B.9). In the “planning to budget” and “plan implementation” phases, resources will be allocated, and committees and personnel with oversight of objectives will initiate completion of action plans. In the “assess and evaluate” phase, measures will be assessed and progress reports will be written. In the “planning” phase, action plans will be revised and created to support ongoing objectives, with the writing of supporting resource requests that will be prioritized through the budget process.

1. Assess and Evaluate
Committees will assess and evaluate progress made towards action plans and objectives using the existing online ESMP progress tracking system. At the beginning of each fall semester, oversight committees will collect measure updates for their assigned action plans. Committees will review and analyze these datasets and determine any actions that would lead to improvement in the measure. At the end of the spring semester, committees will provide a status report as a separate part of their annual assessment.
At the beginning of each fall semester, the Strategic Planning Committee will review annual assessments from each oversight committee and compile a summary of progress towards the action plan.

2. Planning
During the fall semester, as a result of assessment and evaluation, committees with oversight of action plans will make recommendations to change the action plans, add new action plans, and submit resource requests to allocate additional resources.

3. Planning to Budget
At the beginning of the spring semester, resource requests submitted by committees with oversight of action plans will be prioritized using the existing College resource request prioritization process (see Standard I.B.5).

4. Plan Implementation
Upon allocation of resources in the summer, responsible committees will monitor progress towards completion of action plans and ensure that allocated resources are utilized. Progress will be documented in committee minutes, to be used as evidence as part of assessment and evaluation in the next cycle.
Action Project #2
Success: Decrease Time to Completion

I. Identification of project

The College believes time to completion is the most significant factor prohibiting student success. The trends over the past six years indicate that the career/workforce goal oriented student population has decreased significantly (from 30% in 2009 to 15% in 2014) and the number of students with a goal of transfer to a four-year school has increased significantly (from 26% in 2009 to 46% in 2014). Over 60% of our students have an educational goal of transfer to four-year school or career/workforce. Decreasing time to completion will help the College better realize its mission of empowering students to achieve their educational and career goals by increasing access and success through its transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills programs. At LACC, 44% of students who earn a degree take over six years to attain such a degree. Subgroups shown to be the most disproportionally impacted in degree/certificate completion and transfer are African American, Latina/o American, males, 25 years old or older, and disabled students (Educational and Strategic Master Plan 2014-2020, pp.18-19). To address this issue, the College has long-term plans to increase awards production, ensure that students reach certain momentum points including the rate in which they complete basic skills, and close achievement gaps (Educational and Strategic Master Plan 2014-2020, Objectives 2.1, 2.2). By providing increased support and guidance to promote student completion, and by requiring students to complete math and English early in their studies, students will be more likely to complete their academic and career goals.

A. Connection to Self Evaluation

The action project of decreasing the average time it takes students to complete awards came out of the institutional self evaluation.

The first objective is to fully implement the College’s matriculation plan. The objective came out of the recognition that the College has to continue to evaluate its support services (Standard II.C.1) to develop additional processes for ensuring compliance. The College also recognizes it needs to provide improved access for all students (Standard II.C.3), including online orientations and automated educational plans. The College needs to expand counseling and advising to support student success (Standard II.C.5), and expand its admissions policies (Standard II.C.6) to better serve students in the matriculation process.

The second objective is to expand the existing First Year Experience program for full-time entering students and develop a City Pathways College for part-time students taking Math and English. To do so, the College would have to continue to evaluate its support services (Standard II.C.1) so that it can provide the requisite counseling, advising, and mentoring to support student success (Standard II.C.5). Faculty would need to be provided additional targeted professional development (Standard III.A.14) towards improving their ability to support incoming students. To complete the objective the College would have to review its existing programs (Standard
I.B.9) to determine how to institutionalize and operationalize these programs to ensure long-term solvency.

The third objective is to create accelerated pathways to decrease the amount of time it takes students to complete basic skills courses. The College recognized it has to review its pre-collegiate level curriculum (Standard II.A.4) and identify additional alternative placement instruments (Standard II.C.7) in order to support these students.

The fourth objective is to create a Second Year Experience so that continuing students would be provided similar support as incoming students. The College recognized that is must meet established expectations for program completion (Standard II.A.6), specifically to ensure students complete their educational goals within six years to meet statewide expectations. The College will have to expand its counseling and advising to support student success (Standard II.C.5), including ensuring completion of education plans, building a faculty mentoring program, and coordinating and supporting cohorts of students towards increased success.

B. Use of Data

The action project is a result of college wide analysis of data. The college level planning cycle provides a quantitative and qualitative data based framework for planning to increase success measures including number of degrees, certificates, and transfers. The program review cycle allows for the same type of analysis at the unit level. Through comprehensive program review, annual updates, College wide discussion at the Days of Dialogue, and Scorecard analyses the College reviewed success rates, unit accumulation, and the length of time for students to complete degrees and certificates. A thorough review of low-performing programs occurred through program review and as part of an Institutional Effectiveness Report to the LACCD Board.

The College has developed numerous plans in support of the ESMP objective to improve success rates. Through the SSSP plan the College reviews the rates at which students are matriculating. Through the Basic Skills Plan the College reviews success rates in basic skills Math and English. Through the Student Equity Plan the College reviews disproportionate impact in terms of ethnicity, age, gender, economic status, disability, veterans, and foster youth. Through Achieving the Dream the College reviewed success rates and persistence in basic skills courses, degrees, and transfer. In the writing of the 2015-2020 Technology Resources Plan, the College considered how it would provide students with adequate access to the computers, networks, and connectivity that are required to achieve their academic goals. In the writing of the 2015-2020 Staff and Organizational Development Plan, the College considered how professional development activities impact equity and increase student success.

II. Goal

Goal 2: Los Angeles City College will decrease the average time it takes students to complete awards by improving learner-centered pathways to help students achieve their educational and career goals.
III. Objectives, Action Plans, Responsible Parties, Timeline, Resources, Outcomes

**Objective 2.1:** Fully implement the SSSP Plan

**Measure 2.1:** All new students who are required to complete matriculation are assessed, complete orientation, complete the placement process, and develop an abbreviated or comprehensive student education plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 2.1</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards alignment: II.C.1, II.C.3, II.C.5, II.C.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1.1</strong> Complete seamless process for tracking completion of online orientation</td>
<td>SSSP Committee</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Modernization of online student information system</td>
<td>All new students complete online orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1.2</strong> Complete common assessment tool that is accessible online</td>
<td>SSSP Committee</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Online common assessment tool</td>
<td>All new students who are required to complete matriculation are assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1.3</strong> Complete automated abbreviated educational plans</td>
<td>SSSP Committee</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Online student information system with automated abbreviated educational plan</td>
<td>All new students who are required to complete matriculation develop an abbreviated education plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1.4</strong> Complete comprehensive educational plans</td>
<td>SSSP Committee</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>All new students with 15 units develop a comprehensive student education plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 2.2:** Expand the First Year Experience for full-time entering students and the City Pathways College for part-time students taking Math and English

**Measure 2.2:** Expand FYE to 1,000 students and City Pathways College to 500 students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 2.2</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2.2.1** Expand peer to peer mentoring  
*Standards alignment: II.C.1, II.C.5* | Office of Student Life | 2019-20: Provide mentoring for 20% of participating students | Training for student mentors | Increased number of students involved in student mentor/ambassadors program (200 for FYE and 100 for City Pathways College) |
| **2.2.2** Provide professional development for faculty engaging in FYE/City Pathways  
*Standards alignment: III.A.14* | Staff and Organizational Development | 2016-17 | Online faculty orientation/training | Increased faculty familiarity with and participation in first-year student programs  
Increase in competency in SI instructors and participating faculty |
| **2.2.3** Increase percentage of supplemental instruction (SI) throughout the educational pathway  
*Standards alignment: II.C.1, II.C.5* | COMPASS, SI Coordinator | 2019-20: All basic skills courses have an SI instructor | SI Mentors | Increased number of courses with supplemental instruction, in proportion to the increase in FYE and City Pathways participation  
Increased completion and success rates in courses with SI |
| **2.2.4** Operationalize the FYE and City Pathways program  
*Standards alignment: I.B.9* | Vice President of Student Services | 2019-20 | Hire dedicated Dean to oversee program  
Creation of a Student Success Center | Increased number of students who matriculate from feeder schools  
Increased number of high school one-stop days  
Guaranteed support services and |
### Action Plans for Objective 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>placement for participating students in English, Math, Counseling classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of Writing Center, Pi Shop, and Learning Skills resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 2.3:** Create accelerated basic skills pathways

**Measure 2.3:** Decrease in average time students need to complete the basic skills pathway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 2.3</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3.1</strong> Curriculum development to accelerate student completion of pre-collegiate courses</td>
<td>VP Academic Affairs; Deans and Department Chairs of Math, English, Non-Credit, Learning Skills; Staff and Organizational Development</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development towards familiarity with best practices in accelerating basic skills pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Standards alignment: II.A.4</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of curriculum allowing for acceleration of completion of pre-collegiate courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3.2</strong> Identify additional alternative placement models for student assessment.</td>
<td>Admissions Office; Office of Institutional Effectiveness; Deans and Department Chairs of Math and English; Staff and Organizational Development; Curriculum Committee; Academic Senate</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development towards familiarity with alternative placement models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Standards alignment: II.C.7</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase percentage of students placing into higher level courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 2.4:** Create a Second Year Experience  
**Measure 2.4:** Increase in students completing educational goal within six years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plans for Objective 2.4</th>
<th>Responsible Party/Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Required Resources</th>
<th>Outcomes/Indices of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2.4.1** Ensure that students complete their required comprehensive education plan after completing 15 units (part of SSSP), with career exploration and declaration of a major  
*Standards alignment: I.C.5* | Counseling | 2018 |  | 100% compliance with mandates |
| **2.4.2** Continuation of FYE support services in the second year (for full-time entering students, and for part-time students taking Math and English), with additional focus on support within the major including a faculty-student mentoring program  
*Standards alignment: II.C.5* | Staff and Organizational Development; Academic Senate | 2017-18: Development of faculty mentoring program | Dedicated faculty mentor within the department for participating students | Expand professional development to educate faculty on best practices on academic mentoring |
| **2.4.3** Build and support cohorts for students in ‘signature’ academic programs as identified in QFE Objective 1.1.4, such as STEM, performing arts, and allied health departments  
*Standards alignment: II.C.5* | Counseling, Academic Senate | 2017: Identification of signature programs  
2018-19 Develop cohorts | Dedicated counselors for cohorts of participating students | Increase in course completion and awards production in signature programs |

**IV. Assessment: Continuous Improvement**
Assessment of the action project will occur annually using the established integrated planning cycle, in the same way the College currently reviews its Educational and Strategic Master Plan. For a description of the process, see “Assessment: Continuous Improvement” for Action Plan #1.
IX. Changes and Plans Arising Out of the Self Evaluation Process

Consider moving this to right before the QFE so there’s a logical progression

In preparation for the writing of this Self Evaluation, the College began analyzing how well it was meeting the ACCJC’s standards and policies starting in fall 2013. A follow-up analysis occurred in summer 2014 after the release of the new standards. The analysis included a summary of whether more evidence was needed, where to find existing evidence, and planning agendas for how the campus could better meet the standard. Drafts were saved in fall 2013 and summer 2014 to document the planning agendas that were developed and to facilitate tracking of action plans.

Through the analysis, the College identified a number of areas where improvements or changes were needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change made during the self evaluation process</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized format for naming folders on committee websites on SharePoint</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation and assessment of campus climate survey related to accreditation standards, to be used as data for self evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook, which was vetted through participatory governance committees</td>
<td>I, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated mission based on Standard I.A.1, and documented process for revising the mission in the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook</td>
<td>I.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased campus wide education on new mission, new ESMP, and revised program review process. Ongoing events include Days of Dialogue, Student Services Workshops, Classified Symposium, Faculty Symposium</td>
<td>I.A, I.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded use of SharePoint for tracking unit planning objectives, ensuring alignment with the ESMP, and tracking how campus expenditures are aligned with ESMP priorities</td>
<td>I.A, I.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased assessment of data in ESMP oversight committees, especially in terms of setting targets towards student achievement data and institution set standards</td>
<td>I.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with CTE Committee to develop a method for tracking job placement for appropriate CTE disciplines, as part of developing ESMP and institution set standards</td>
<td>I.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing institution set standards</td>
<td>I.B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregated learning outcomes data for subpopulations of students</td>
<td>I.B.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of the Website Committee, which became the Institutional Integrity committee, to ensure integrity in policies, actions, and communication, with a focus on information posted on the website and printed in the catalog. Writing and approval of the Institutional Integrity Handbook.</td>
<td>I.C.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed program student learning outcomes for degrees and certificates in</td>
<td>I.C.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reinstated the Academic Senate Professional Ethics Committee

Revised ISLOs and remapped outcomes to the new ISLOs

Edited the general education philosophy in the college catalog

Added a distance education philosophy to the general education philosophy in the college catalog

Expanded assessment of Community Services

Created the Student Services SLO Workgroup

Completed a Human Resources Plan

The following plans for future action will be completed as indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for future action (Standard)</th>
<th>Timeline for implementation</th>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a ‘Continuous Improvement Plan’ as an addendum to the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook</td>
<td>Improved integration of campus plan assessments, timeline for evaluating and updating all campus plans, improved integration of supporting plans with the ESMP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut and paste all action plans from earlier in the document [see below]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Plans**

I.A.1.

- The College will meet the standard by revising the mission to reflect the “degrees and other credentials it offers.” The revision will occur through the governance structure in spring and summer 2016 and will be ready for District consideration by fall 2016.I.A.4

I.A.3

- The College will consider if the mission should include any statements related to its commitment to Distance Education. The consideration will take place in the governance structure in spring and summer 2016 and if appropriate will be ready for District consideration by fall 2016.

I.B.6.

- The College will begin using disaggregated learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender for PSLOs starting with an assessment of Spring 2015 data.
- The College needs to research ways to use disaggregated learning outcomes results based on ethnicity and gender at the course level. The College will work with eLumen to determine how our student information system can communicate with their interface.
• OIE to create a data timeline for systematic annual creation and analysis of data, identifying specific committees and outcomes

I.B.7.
• DE Committee to create pre, during, and post student surveys to assess whether students utilize our DE support services. Timeline: Create the survey in spring 2016; implement in fall 2016.

I.C.4.
• Do an assessment of whether the catalog has these, and whether the website reflects what is in the catalog [describe this as an outcome from our initial standards analysis]

I.C.5.
• The College is working on a Continuous Improvement Plan that describes how key integrated planning processes and activities are reviewed, evaluated, and assessed. The Continuous Improvement Plan elaborates on the processes described in the Integrated Planning Handbook and is intended to guide institutional effectiveness and continuous quality improvement. The plan will describe categories and components of the continuous improvement processes, the cycle of evaluation of those processes, and how the processes are aligned with ESMP goals. The plan will be completed and vetted through the governance structure in spring 2016.

I.C.7.
• Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom committee will create a Handbook

II.B.1.
• In 2016-2017, the College needs to follow the library’s model by integrating more learning support services into the DE mode. [elaborate on this…what does it mean?]

II.B.2.
• Administer the library survey to DE students

II.C.2.
• Develop a satisfaction survey instrument for DE students that includes student support services (see DE Plan--which objective is this?)
• Make sure to ask:
  • Which support services they use
  • How often they use the support services
• Survey results will be used to assess student need and result in improvement
• Find resources to hire a dedicated DE coordinator, who among their many other responsibilities will verify that student services support student success in DE courses

II.C.5.
• Develop a stronger DE focused counseling review to ensure that counseling is effective for DE students.
• Research whether there are any services we provide for online students (or just online in general) that support student understanding and appreciation of diversity—if so, write about it. If not, make it an action plan. (FIND OUT WHERE THIS QUESTION CAME FROM)

III.A.13.
• Update the Academic Senate Statement on Ethics
• Add a Code of Ethics page to the “Fac/Staff” website main page…link to the Board Rule 1204

III.A.14.
• Change the Flex Reporting Form to include description of how the activities led to improved teaching and learning
• Develop a Professional Development Handbook that defines appropriate activities that qualify for Flex

IV.A.1.
• Create a single webpage with links to all our institutional performance data, including historical data. Consider ways to combine Office of Research with OIE pages.

IV.A.7
• Ask the College Council and Academic Senate to create an end of year document that describes all recommendations passed and how those recommendations resulted in improved College operations. The document should include a summary of subcommittee annual assessments. Such a document will provide a clear way to communicate how we evaluate our governance and decision-making structures.
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