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Los Angeles Harbor College 2016 Self-Evaluation Report
Executive Summary

Harbor College’s 2016 Self Evaluation Report examines where the College is efficient and effective and where the College could better achieve its mission, as follows:

Los Angeles Harbor College promotes access and student success through associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction. Our educational programs and support services meet the needs of diverse communities as measured by campus institutional learning outcomes.

Organization: To fulfill its mission and monitor continuous improvement, the College completed its regularly scheduled midterm report in March 2015. Simultaneously the college organized for a full self-evaluation in March 2016. The College’s governing bodies (College Planning Council, Academic Senate, and Accreditation Steering Committee) decided to organize the work within the existing shared governance committees, with accreditation as a standing agenda item for each committee meeting. Data from the State Chancellor’s Scorecard, Achieving the Dream, Equity, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), and the Basic Skills Initiative, as well as assessment data from course, program, general education, and institutional learning outcomes, served as the basis for examining the mission’s goal of access and student achievement.

Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality, Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity. The College aligned its four strategic goals with those established by the LACCD and clarified the tools for measurement in its Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). Both the institutional learning outcomes and the goals of the SEMP align with the mission, so achieving both inherently fulfills the mission. To evaluate the SEMP, the College streamlined its existing planning process into Harbor’s Assessment–based Planning System (HAPS).

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services. To fulfill the College mission, the Instructional Program offers associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction. The College has developed thirteen AA-T/AS-T degrees that provide pathways for student completion. Library and Learning Support Services provides workshops and specialized tutoring that contribute to stronger retention and completion. Student Support Services promote access with orientation, assessment, and educational planning for students. Special programs such as Puente, CHAMPS (Challenging Athletes Minds for Personal Success), and Harbor Advantage—a first year experience program—increase access and student success for underserved populations.

Standard III: Resources. The Human Resources Committee and the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee conduct inclusive and methodical prioritizations of faculty and classified needs based on program review data and unit planning. Priorities are tied to budget availability in order to maintain fiscal accountability. Decisions regarding Physical Resources are inclusively based upon input from the college-wide Core Committee. Technology Resources include a redesigned and more accessible College website, including all College documents accessible in SharePoint. Financial Resources are transparent with weekly budget updates provided to Senior Staff and monthly reviews included on the agenda of the Budget Committee.

Standard IV Leadership and Governance: “Systems” planning leading to institutional effectiveness are the primary focus for college leadership, shared governance, the President, and the District.

Improvement Actions 2016-2019 as Highlighted in the Quality Focus Essay: 1) Integrate “systems” principles into the assessment and planning processes; 2) Strengthen collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services; 3) Formalize college wide communications.
Los Angeles Harbor College promotes access and student success through associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction. Our educational programs and support services meet the needs of diverse communities as measured by campus institutional learning outcomes.
Accreditation “Climate”
  Incorporate standards into committee work - agenda item

Effective Committee Participation
  Inclusive (administrators, faculty, staff, & students)

Data
  - Student Achievement Data
  - Scorecard, Equity Plan, BSI, SSSP

Learning Outcomes
  Student, Program, General Education, and Institutional Learning Outcomes
Using the Data

• **Communication**
  Harbor Success Days, presentations & dialogue

• **Organization**
  Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP)

• **Strategic goals and measures**
  • 1. Access and Preparation for Success
  • 2. Teaching and Learning for Success
  • 3. Institutional Effectiveness
  • 4. Resources and Collaboration

• **Use**
  Harbor Assessment Based Planning
Planning

Outcome Assessment Process

Mission

Resource Allocation

Annual College Priority Plan

Strategic Educational Master Plan and Annual Functional Plans

Annual Unit Priority Plans

Annual Cluster Priority Plans

Use Results:
- Improvement Plan / Resource Allocation

Program Outcomes:
- ILOs or Strategic Educational Master Plan Measures

Outcomes Assessment / Analysis:
- SLO Evaluation / Program Review

Collect Data:
- Student Achievement, Learning Outcomes, External Scans
Standard I:
Mission, Academic Quality, Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

- Pilot Program (Fall 2015)

- Mission, SEMP, HAPS = Institutional Effectiveness
Standard II:  
Student Learning Programs and Support Services

• **IIA- Instructional Programs**  
  Associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, basic skills instruction - 13 AA, AS, T
degrees, curriculum

• **IIB- Library and Learning Support Service**  
  Library workshops & Learning Support Services (tutoring, academic workshops)

• **IIC- Student Support Services**  
  Access and student success, special programs PUENTE, CHAMPS, HARBOR ADVANTAGE

• **Impact on Student Success**
Standard III: Resources and Inclusive Planning

• IIIA - Human Resources
  Methodical prioritization of faculty (FHPC) and classified hiring (HR Committee)

• IIIB - Physical Resources
  Construction decisions & completion (CORE), emergency training (WEC)

• IIIC - Technology Resources
  Web redesign, wireless initiative, teaching-learning (TAC)

• IIID - Financial Resources
  Budget transparency & accountability (Budget)
Standard IV:
Leadership and Governance

- **IVA - Decision-Making Roles and Processes**
  - Participatory Governance
  - Timely and broad communications
  - Regular evaluations

- **IVB - Chief Executive Officer**
  - Focus on improvement in institutional effectiveness
  - Enhanced institutional capacity

- **IVC - Governing Board**
  - Establishment and adherence to policies and bylaws
  - Regular review of student learning and achievement outcomes

- **IVD - Multi-College Districts or Systems**
  - Delineation of functions and responsibilities
  - Chancellor’s cabinet
1. Infuse “Systems” principles into the assessment and planning process

2. Strengthen collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services

3. Formalize college wide communications
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Introduction

History of Los Angeles Harbor College

Los Angeles Harbor College is one of 113 public two-year community colleges in the California Community Colleges and one of nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District, the largest district in the state. The College is located approximately 20 miles south of downtown Los Angeles. The primary service area includes the 15th District of Los Angeles (Harbor City, Harbor Gateway, San Pedro, and Wilmington) and the cities of Carson, Gardena, Lomita, Palos Verdes Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills, and some parts of Torrance, Long Beach, and Redondo Beach.

The College, established in 1949, was first known as “Harbor Tech” and then “Harbor Junior College,” before adopting its present name in 1965. The initial enrollment of the College was 650 students, 80% male and 70% graduates of San Pedro High School. By 1965, the College had grown to approximately 5,000 students with a balance of male and female students. Today, Harbor College enrolls approximately 11,000 students, 60% female and 40% male, at a single campus location.

By the early 1950s, the college had grown from a group of Quonset huts to six buildings; by 1963, the Administration, Astronomy, Business, and Science buildings were constructed along with the Seahawk Center—the student activity hub. In 1965, the Fine Arts building was completed, and by 1969, Drama/Speech, General Classrooms, and service and storage buildings were added. In 1977, the Music building was constructed, and the Nursing building in 1980. These buildings comprised the campus until the Los Angeles Community College District adopted the largest facilities construction bond issue in the history of the District in 2000. Using Bond funding, the College renovated the Fine Arts, Theatre, Nursing and Music buildings and constructed the Northeast Academic Hall, Student Services and Administration building, central plant buildings, PE/Wellness Center, Child Development center, a Science Complex, a Technology building, and a Library and Learning Resources building.

The College’s 86-acre campus is part of a reserve that includes the College, a recreational lake, a wildlife sanctuary, a public park, and a golf course. The College is located in the western portion of the Los Angeles suburb of Wilmington, California, a community long known for its petroleum refineries and proximity to the Port of Los Angeles. The College is separated from much of the neighboring residential area by the Harbor Freeway (I-110), which, in turn, offers the College high visibility and easy accessibility.

The College employs 13 administrators, 76 regular faculty, 304 hourly faculty, and 138 classified employees. In the fiscal year 2013-14, the general fund budget was $31,555,363 with an additional $12.1 million from other sources including specially funded programs, categorical funds, and grants and $17.2 million in financial aid.

Major Developments since the 2012 Self-Evaluation

Leadership

Since the last self-evaluation in 2012, Los Angeles Harbor College has experienced several leadership changes. Dr. Otto Lee was named president of Los Angeles Harbor College in July 2014. Prior to Dr. Lee’s appointment, Mr. Farley Herzek served as interim president for the 2013-2014 academic year,
and Mr. Marvin Martinez served as president from 2010 to 2013. Prior, the college experienced several periods of stable administrative leadership:

- Dr. Linda M. Spink, 2000-2010
- Francisco C. Quiambao Jr., (Acting) 1999-2000
- James L. Heinselman, 1980-1989
- Eugene A. Pimentel, 1972-1979
- Kenneth W. Williams, (Acting) 1971-1972
- Wendell C. Black, 1958-1971
- Raymond J. Casey, (Director) 1949-1958

In July 2015, two interim vice presidents—academic affairs and student support services—were selected to fill the simultaneous retirements of vice presidents who had served the college for many years—seven years for the vice president, academic affairs (who had been at the college a total of 37 years) and 12 years for the vice president, student support services. The Vice President of Administrative Services joined Harbor in spring 2015 when the xx-year incumbent moved to another college in the district. Two new deans of academic affairs were hired in 2013, and a new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness was hired in spring 2015.

Finally, the Los Angeles Community College District hired a new chancellor, Dr. Francisco Rodriguez, starting June 1, 2014.

**New Campus Buildings**

Since the last visit, two major instructional buildings have been completed at the College. In spring 2014, the Library/Learning Resource Center opened. The Library Learning Resource Center (LLRC) is a two story building comprised of over 30,000 square feet of assignable space, within a building sized at over 40,000 total square feet. The building is on two floors in the central area of the campus and is home to the Library, the Learning Resource Center (LRC), and a portion of Special Programs & Services (SPS).

The first floor consists of a portion of the Library, the entire LRC, and the portion of the SPS that is housed in the LLRC. The Library on the first floor includes a computer commons space (containing approximately 100 computers), a library circulation desk, reserves collections, microfiche archives, and checkout. The LRC includes four learning centers, designated tutoring spaces, and offices. The SPS area consists of a High-Tech classroom, other classrooms, and offices. The main floor also has two main entrances, an atrium lobby, a dedicated staff entrance, photocopy/print facilities and automated book drops. The second floor primarily consists of the remainder of the Library including such areas as the Library offices, a Library classroom, general collections, group study/testing rooms, and a periodical room. The second floor also contains a staff lounge, a conference room, and photocopy facilities.

The rooftop is covered with “heat island resistant white roofing” and approximately 70kW of “photovoltaic (PV) panels”. The immediate landscaping around the building is drought resistant and will eventually become part of the overall campus landscaping plan.

The building was designed to fulfill the goals of the original Campus Master Plan of defining a prominent new campus mall with several other new buildings. Unique features of the LLRC building
include the south façade which is clad with a curtain wall made of high-efficiency glass and horizontal louveres to block the southern sun; motion sensor lighting, security cameras, “glass box” style periodical and conference rooms overlooking the campus; and user-friendly way-finding systems intended to promote circulation flow.

The Science Complex opened in fall 2013 and houses the physical and life science programs. This 73,767 square-foot, three-story building provides state-of-the art lecture halls, classrooms, science and computer laboratories, conference and faculty lounge space, and administrative offices. It achieved LEED Platinum certification as a result of dozens of sustainable elements including solar and wind generation, day lighting and advanced HVAC componentry.

Achieving the Dream/ ATD Leader College
Los Angeles Harbor College joined Achieving the Dream in 2011, the national initiative that seeks to identify barriers to student achievement and then implement college wide strategies for addressing the obstacles. In fall 2014, the College was recognized as an ATD Leader College based on its implementation of success strategies, informed by the evaluation of data, which led to increased fall-to-spring persistence rates for all students in the ATD cohort and specifically for Hispanic students. Data from 2009-10 to 2012-13 indicated steady overall progression. In 2009-10, 64.6% of students persisted from fall to spring. That figure increased to 64.9% in 2010-11, to 65.9 in 2011-12, and finally to 69.6% in 2012-13. Overall, an increase of 5% was experienced for the reporting years. The groups showing the most overall improvements were Hispanics, with a growth of 7.7% between 2009-10 and 2012-13, and females, with an overall increase of 6.2% in four years.

A focus on Hispanic students is essential for student success as the Hispanic population at Harbor College continues to see growth. Between fall 2006 and 2012, the Hispanic male population increased by almost 5% and Hispanic female by 7%. Between fall 2006 and 2012, the Hispanic population increased by 6.2%, from 46.1% to 52.3%. Overall, Hispanic students make up 58.9% of Harbor’s first-time student enrollment and 49% of non-first-time students (fall 2012 term). In addition, per other ATD measures, Hispanic males showed consistency in enrollment with more that 60% enrolling in English within their first year. More specifically, all but one of the disaggregated groups demonstrated increased successful persistence from term-to-term, from an increase of 1.6% for Other to 7.7% for Hispanics. Females also showed an overall increase of 6.2% over the four year period.

Success Initiatives
Since the 2012 report, Harbor College accomplished much in terms of advancing student success. The creation of the Student Success “Umbrella” Committee in fall 2013, which became the Student Success Coordinating Committee in spring 2015, exemplifies the College’s efforts to combine separate student success efforts into one campus wide endeavor. The SSCC oversees Achieving the Dream, California Basic Skills Initiative, the activities included in the Student Equity Plan, and District student success efforts and works collaboratively with student services to implement the Student Success and Support Program plan that requires all students to complete orientation, assessment, and an educational plan prior to registering for classes.

These collaborative efforts, and the application of a data-driven decision and evaluation model, resulted in a number of sustained interventions and college wide plans to enhance student success, including:

1. Harbor Advantage
A First Year Experience (FYE) program was initiated in fall 2012 after the ATD Core team reviewed data provided by the ATD Data team. This review included numerous sources, including persistence and completion rates. Focus groups with student leaders were also conducted to share the data with students and obtain their input. (Student focus group presentation1). The data
analysis indicated that Harbor students experience consistently low retention rates. Based on the analysis, the ATD Core team recommended to the College Planning Council that a first year experience program be established and funded and include a redesign of student orientation and assessment processes; assessment preparation; and cohort scheduling of and English, general elective, personal development and service learning courses. The ATD Core team set a goal for the FYE program of an improved retention rate of 10% in the initial year. Seventy students participated in the first FYE, and an analysis of the data determined that the intervention was a success. In fall 2012, the retention rate for students in the FYE English class was 16% higher, and the overall success rate was 30% higher than for students in a comparison group. (FYE Course Retention & Completion) Based on this success, the cohort was increased to 120 students in fall 2013, and in fall 2014, the Student Success Umbrella recommended that the FYE program be included in the Educational Master Plan as the Harbor Advantage, a scaled FYE that provides all first time in college students who want to participate a guaranteed prescribed program of study; mandatory assessment, orientation, and counseling; and faculty mentors in the student’s career pathway. (CPC minutes 3/10/14) Harbor Advantage is also included in the Student Success and Support Program Plan, and the Student Equity Plan. (Student Success and Support Program Plan; Student Equity Plan)

The target group for Harbor Advantage is new incoming students and continuing students with fewer than 10 units. These students are recruited from local high schools—students who normally come to Harbor College in the fall term following high school graduation. Harbor Advantage grew from 70 students in the initial pilot in fall 2013 to 120 students in fall 2013 to 265 students in fall 2014 to 425 students in fall 2015. Harbor Advantage term-to-term persistence (fall 2014 to spring 2015) was 85.5%, 15% higher than first-time in college students not enrolled in the program. Successful course completion for Harbor Advantage students was 70% compared to 62% for non HA students. In addition, the average units completed for HA students for fall 2014 was 9.86 compared to 6.82 for non HA students.

2. Culturally Responsive Training
Culturally Responsive Training goals include recognizing and enhancing existing strengths as accomplishments of ethnically diverse student populations (transformation); affirming the heritage, learning style, and home culture of learners (validating); developing intellectual, social, emotional, and political learning (comprehensive); and encompassing curriculum content, learning content, and classroom climate (multidimensional). It is a multi-faceted initiative engaging faculty, staff, administrators, and students in the recursive process of self-reflection, dialogue, change, and growth regarding cultural understanding and cooperation in order to actively address individual and collective self-awareness, attitudes, and believes, knowledge of others, and the skills need to implement new understandings through best practices of cultural competence.

To date, the CRT workshops have been attended by 110 faculty, staff and administrators. In addition, the CRT team presented at the fall 2014 RP Group Strengthening Student Success Conference and was invited by the new Los Angeles Community College District chancellor to present at his first management team retreat in spring 2015. In July 2015, Harbor College will host a second training by the facilitators from the Community College of Baltimore County, with faculty and staff from sister colleges Pierce and West Los Angeles participating. The training will include new modules of culture awareness per the CCBC model and increase the number of Harbor trainers from seven to eleven.

3. CHAMPS
An additional effort implemented by the college on a large scale in spring 2015 is the CHAMPS program. This program—Challenging Athletes’ Minds for Personal Success—is embraced by the
faculty and coaches in the Kinesiology division and attendance at the programs workshops and CHAMPS Success Center (tutoring) is mandated for all Athletes’ (approximately 250 each semester). This program enhances student-athlete engagement, gives them the tools and support needed to successfully advance in their education and sport, and supports interaction between Athletes’, coaches, faculty, staff, and support programs. The mission is to enhance the quality of the student-athlete experience within the context of higher education. The program supports student-athlete development and excellence in five areas: Academics, Athletics, Personal Development, Career Development, and Community Service.

The goals of the program are to serve the high-risk students shown to be low in course completion rates, decreasing dropout rates, and increasing the percentage of student-Athletes’ retention, completion, and transfer rates. Some strategies of the program include: mentors, SAAC (Student Athlete Advisory Council), grade checks/progress reports, study hall (CHAMPS Success Center), tutoring assistance, an academic counselor, guest speakers and workshops with various campus departments, a student handbook and website for CHAMPS. The workshops cover various topics including: Goal Setting & Time Management, Etiquette and Communication, Stress Management and Competitive Anxiety, Money Management and Financial Aid, Drugs and Alcohol Awareness, The Go-Giver (Community Service), and Teamwork and Conflict Management.

4. Student Equity Plan
Another example of data-driven planning is seen in the selection of activities included in the Student Equity Plan, a requirement of the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCCO). Following specific CCCCCO data protocols, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness evaluated the Harbor College student population in five different categories, including access, completion, and transfer, and disaggregated the data by ethnicity, gender, and several other indicators. Institutional Effectiveness reviewed the data with a subcommittee of the Student Success Coordinating (Umbrella) Committee (SSCC), whose members created an Equity Plan that proposed goals, activities, and evaluation plans to address disproportionate impacts experienced by specific student populations. (Student Equity Plan) The data indicated that African American males and females and Hispanic males were not completing courses at a rate that was proportional to other student populations. For example, the data showed that course completion by African American students is 26% lower than the general student population. The SSCC set a goal to improve the completion rates for the targeted students by 6% each academic year through 2016-2017 (an 18% total increase). Based on the analysis, the Student Success Coordinating (Umbrella) Committee proposed and received approval for the funding of several strategies, including expanding the Harbor Advantage program and creating student support groups for specific student populations. (CPC minutes 11/10/14) Beginning spring 2015, the college initiated the CHAMPS program (Changing Athlete’s Minds for Personal Success) to offer student services and instructional support for Harbor College student Athletes’ of which nearly 30% are African American. The SSCC leads the evaluation of this program and make recommendations to the College Planning Council for future planning for CHAMPS.

Description of Student Enrollment Data

Since the last educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, student enrollment data has remained relatively stable. The charts below profile the College demographics with respect to the four goals in the Strategic Educational Master Plan: Access and Preparation for Success, Teaching and Learning for Success, and Institutional Effectiveness, and Resources and Collaboration.
## Goal 1: Access and Preparation for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</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>Concurrent HS Students</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Students</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfer Students</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Students</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>5,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Students</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credit Students</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,511</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,525</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,104</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,059</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Office of Institutional Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit/Non-Credit</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>Credit Students</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>9,525</td>
<td>10,104</td>
<td>10,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Students</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</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>Female</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</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>African American</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</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>Under 20</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 year old</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 and over</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Goal</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>Transfer to 4 Year</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/Vocational Degree</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Prep</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Workforce</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year College Credit</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided/Unknown</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Load</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>12 units or more</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 11 units</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 units or less</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOGG</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>7,762</td>
<td>8,494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Teaching and Learning for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scorecard</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Transfer Completion</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Unit Completion</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial English Progress</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Math Progress</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial ESL Progress</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE (Career Technical Education)</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community College Student Success Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degrees</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Certificates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>732</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Stud_Creddata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Transfers</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Transfers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State Private (ISP)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State (OOS)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>505</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ISP and OOS data from CCC Data Mart; CSU and UC data from LACCD Institutional Performance & Accountability
**Goal 3: Institutional Effectiveness; and**
**Goal 4: Resources and Collaboration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing (Fall 2014)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Asian/Pac Islander</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Hourly Faculty</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>531</strong></td>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCCC Data Mart; Ethnicity based on percentages from LACCD a20 report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency Measures</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per enrollment</td>
<td>$1,587</td>
<td>$1,449</td>
<td>$1,448</td>
<td>$1,546</td>
<td>$1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per FTES</td>
<td>$4,179</td>
<td>$3,821</td>
<td>$4,057</td>
<td>$4,472</td>
<td>$4,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per FTES/District</td>
<td>$3,798</td>
<td>$3,851</td>
<td>$4,048</td>
<td>$4,158</td>
<td>$4,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Final Budget Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-End Expenditures</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>$16,706,834</td>
<td>$16,154,172</td>
<td>$15,623,507</td>
<td>$14,918,787</td>
<td>$16,625,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Certificated</td>
<td>$6,198,156</td>
<td>$5,974,608</td>
<td>$6,076,380</td>
<td>$6,125,237</td>
<td>$6,482,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$5,787,702</td>
<td>$5,807,178</td>
<td>$6,103,483</td>
<td>$6,191,852</td>
<td>$6,347,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$296,535</td>
<td>$192,609</td>
<td>$205,191</td>
<td>$201,616</td>
<td>$235,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$1,347,967</td>
<td>$1,405,125</td>
<td>$753,076</td>
<td>$1,243,172</td>
<td>$1,459,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$92,025</td>
<td>$45,834</td>
<td>$33,741</td>
<td>$53,905</td>
<td>$32,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$445,985</td>
<td>$429,168</td>
<td>$387,453</td>
<td>$472,433</td>
<td>$371,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,875,204</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,008,694</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,182,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,207,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,555,363</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Final Budget Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unduplicated Enrollment:</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>Credit Students</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>9,525</td>
<td>10,104</td>
<td>10,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Students</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unduplicated Enrollment:</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>Female</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unduplicated Enrollment:</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>African American</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unduplicated Enrollment:</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>Under 20</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 year old</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and older</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Office of Institutional Effectiveness; Noncredit Count from LACCD IRDS Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Goal:</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>Transfer to 4 Year</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/Vocational Degree</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Prep</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Workforce</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year College Credit</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided/Unknown</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Office of Institutional Effectiveness

### Study Load:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Load</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>12 units or more</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 11 units</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 units or less</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Office of Institutional Effectiveness

### Quick Facts:

- 47.7% of students are first generation college students
- 53.7% receive financial aid
- 94.9% are U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents
- English is the most spoken language at home (88.2%), followed by Spanish (7.4%), Tagalog (1.2%), and Korean (0.4%)

**Sources:** Data for the Annual College Profile were taken from various reliable sources within the Los Angeles Community College District as well as external reporting agencies:

- Los Angeles Community College District Office of Institutional Effectiveness
- California Community College’s Chancellor’s Office Management Information Systems Data Mart
- Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges
- Los Angeles Community College District Student Information System
- Los Angeles Community College District Final Budget Reports

### Description of the Student Population/Service Area:

The Los Angeles Community College District identified 24 zip codes surrounding LAHC where most of Harbor’s students reside.

Harbor College serves a diverse community. Of the service area population 15 years old and over, 40% are Hispanic, 26% are White, 19% are Asian/Pacific Islander, 12% are African American, and 2% are American Indian/Multi-Ethnic. In fall 2014, the student population was primarily Hispanic (54%), followed by White (14%), African American (14%), Asian/Pacific Islander (17%), and American Indian/Multi-Ethnic/Other (1%). These percentages remained stable from fall 2012 to fall 2014.

In fall 2014, females comprised 52% of adults 18 years old and over in our service area and 59% of our student population. Males comprise 48% of our service area and 40% of our student population. The percentage of female to male, from fall 2012 to fall 2014, remained stable.

### Description of Service Area: Demographic and Socio-Economic Data

Demography, poverty level, median household income, educational attainment, and other characteristics vary greatly within the service area communities. For example, according to the American Community Survey by the U.S. Census Bureau, the median household income in Palos Verdes Peninsula is $150,395 while in Wilmington it is $43,364. The percentage of people whose income was below the poverty level in the past 12 months was 18.1% in Gardena and only 2.5% in Palos Verdes Peninsula. Of the population 25 years and over, more than 66% in the Palos Verdes communities have at least a Bachelor’s degree. In Wilmington, that percentage drops to 7.2%. In
addition, it is worth noting that in past five years, residents from the Palos Verdes area only comprise about 4.8% of our student enrollment.

As a whole, the median household income in Harbor’s service area is about 16% higher than L.A. County and 6% higher compared to the State. The poverty level is slightly lower (1.4%) than the county and .39% higher than the State. Of the population 25 years and over, about 21% in our neighboring communities do not have a high school diploma, while L.A. County has 24% and the State with 19% without a high school diploma.

Academic performance and progress in public K-12 schools are measured by their API or Academic Performance Indicator score. According to the California Department of Education, this figure ranges from 200 to 1,000 and the target for all schools is 800.

### Median Household Income (Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAHC Service Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$65,151</td>
<td>$56,241</td>
<td>$61,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau

### Percentage of All People Whose Income in the Past 12 Months was Below the Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAHC Service Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau

### Educational Attainment (Population 25 years and older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>LAHC Service Area</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th Grade</td>
<td>11.07%</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th Grade, No Diploma</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate (Includes Equivalency)</td>
<td>21.64%</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>20.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>21.24%</td>
<td>19.60%</td>
<td>22.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's Degree</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>19.33%</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional Degree</td>
<td>9.56%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau

### Local High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>High School Type</th>
<th>2012 Base API Score</th>
<th>2012 Statewide API Rank</th>
<th>2012-2013 Cohort High School Graduation Rate</th>
<th>LAHC Fall 2012 High School Origin of First-Time New Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson Senior High</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.90%</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena Senior High</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.56%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Teacher Preparation Academy</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Dual enrollment at LAHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Narbonne Senior High</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.53%</td>
<td>11.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes High</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99.55%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes Peninsula High</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98.62%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of the Service Area Labor Market

The economy of the region served by LAHC (“the LAHC Economic Region”) is primarily driven by the Health Care & Social Assistance, Manufacturing, and Retail Trade industries. The Health Care & Social Assistance and Retail Trade sectors added new jobs between 2009 and 2014 and are projected to continue to grow through 2024. Manufacturing; Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, & Hunting; Utilities; and Management of Companies & Enterprises faced declines or low growth and are projected to continue losing jobs over the next decade. Overall the regional job growth is expected to be 14% over the next decade. (Economic Overview and Program Gap Analysis September 2015)

- Some high-skill occupational categories are projected to see dependable job growth over the next ten years, including healthcare practitioners and technical occupations (19% job growth) and business & financial operations occupations (14% job growth). Between 2014 and 2024, the highest number of average annual job openings for workers with postsecondary certificates and above are projected to occur within sales & related occupations, office & administrative support occupations, and management occupations.

- Around 63% of residents in the area commute outside the LAHC Economic Region for work, and roughly 58% of the LAHC Economic Region workers reside outside the area, indicating that there are strong economic links between the LAHC Economic Region and the surrounding communities for both out-commuters and in-commuters.

- The educational composition of the adult population in the LAHC Economic Region (people age 24 and older) has seen a very small shift in recent years. Between 2009 and 2014, the proportion of adults with a bachelor’s degree increased by 0.2 percentage points, while the proportion with a graduate degree and higher decreased by 0.2 percentage points. All other levels of educational attainment have remained relatively unchanged. Between both postsecondary certificate level and associate’s degree level, there are a total of 11 programs associated with significant workforce gaps—with the top three programs having gaps at both levels. There were 13 programs associated with significant workforce surpluses. Only four had a surplus at the certificate level.

- General Cooking & Related Culinary Arts has the largest certificate level gap (gap of 833). Accounting Technology/Technician & Bookkeeping (gap of 191, median hourly wage $18.75) and Child Care Provider/Assistant (gap of 131, median hourly wage $7.07) are the second and third largest gaps at the certificate level.

- The top two surpluses at the postsecondary certificate level are General Administrative & Secretarial Science (surplus of 282) and Fire Prevention & Safety Technology/Technician (surplus of 22).

- Accounting Technology/Technician & Bookkeeping is the only certificate program with a significant work force gap that pays median wages of greater than $12 an hour.
• Eight associate’s degree programs also registered gaps. The top three gaps are the same as the certificate level: General Cooking & Related Culinary Arts (gap of 915), Accounting Technology/Technician & Bookkeeping (gap of 195), and Child Care Provider/Assistant (gap of 82).

• The top two surpluses at the associate’s degree level are Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse (surplus of 187) and Biological & Physical Sciences (surplus of 118). Some of the completers are likely getting jobs outside the LAHC Economic Region.

• There are 36 postsecondary certificate level areas of opportunity identified. Many skilled trades and blue collar occupations like heavy & tractor-trailer truck drivers, carpenters, and general maintenance & repair workers appear to be undersupplied in the LAHC Economic Region.

• Seven areas of opportunity are at the associate’s degree level. Several medical and scientific technicians appear to be undersupplied such as dental hygienists and physical therapist assistants. All of the potential new programs at the associate’s degree level have relatively high wages (greater than $17 an hour).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2014 JOBS</th>
<th>2024 JOBS</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>(357)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>8,884</td>
<td>10,156</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>42,161</td>
<td>48,404</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>86,907</td>
<td>83,221</td>
<td>(3,686)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>38,242</td>
<td>43,456</td>
<td>5,214</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>78,879</td>
<td>89,033</td>
<td>10,154</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>55,548</td>
<td>62,454</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>24,644</td>
<td>29,942</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>46,114</td>
<td>57,044</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>49,876</td>
<td>57,492</td>
<td>7,616</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>8,647</td>
<td>8,513</td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Admin. &amp; Support &amp; Waste Mgmt. &amp; Remediation Services</td>
<td>62,288</td>
<td>70,895</td>
<td>8,607</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>13,835</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>110,359</td>
<td>138,649</td>
<td>28,290</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>10,741</td>
<td>12,399</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>58,086</td>
<td>71,090</td>
<td>13,004</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>56,370</td>
<td>65,010</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>55,303</td>
<td>55,390</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>817,923</strong></td>
<td><strong>930,195</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,271</strong></td>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards

Introduction: Integrating Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards with College Program Review, Planning and Resource Allocation Processes

The College Mission is implemented through the college Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). The SEMP identifies institutional goals and articulates the objectives and performance measures that evaluate the achievement of these goals. The mission is further implemented through the achievement of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO). ISLOs are measured through the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level. Harbor’s institutional outcomes conform with those articulated in the Los Angeles Community College District Strategic Plan assuring that the College’s mission is in alignment with the District’s. Together, these institutional outcomes provide a framework to evaluate the achievement of the college Mission.

The SEMP includes all student achievement measures as well as measures that align with state-required, college functional plans and other institutional priorities. College program review, planning and resource allocation processes use these measures to align program and operational activities with the college mission. The SEMP operates on a three year cycle to assure that the college has sufficient time to achieve institutional outcomes and addresses all institutional requirements. [Planning evaluation report] At the end of the three year cycle, SEMP progress and college-level student achievement data are evaluated and used to assess the achievement of the college mission. The mission evaluation/renewal process then drives the next strategic educational master planning cycle. [Planning and Program Review Manual]

SEMP measures provide a framework for the college-wide Program Review process and the analysis of program-level student achievement data. SEMP measure analysis results are used to generate improvement actions at the program level. These improvement actions are the basis of the college unit planning and resource allocation processes. All of these activities are organized online to track assessment results, unit plans and the request and allocation of resources. Results are summarized for review and oversight by the college administrative and governance process [IMPLEMENTATION GRID/HAPS Outcome Summary Reports]. College level results are used by the College Planning Council to identify annual institutional priorities within the three year strategic planning cycle. These priorities guide annual planning and resource allocation decisions. [Resource allocation manual]

For measures where there is an established institution-set standard, College operational units and instructional programs evaluate their performance based on the standard. Units and programs that do not meet the standard are required to create an improvement activity to address that result. Improvement activities are recorded online in Harbor’s Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS), validated through the college planning process and updated annually throughout the planning cycle. Improvement activities for the unit, which are the result of the unit’s program review, collectively form the annual unit plan. Validated improvement activities organize and track the request and allocation of resources. Using SEMP measures as the basis for program review and the resulting unit plan allows the college to track the allocation of resources in fulfillment of the SEMP and the college mission. [HAPS System Documentation]

Establishing Institution-Set Standards
At the college-level, the SEMP identifies the measures used in Program Review; all measures requiring institution-set standards are included in the SEMP. Data on program-level student achievement and other SEMP measures are provided in the SEMP Fact Book. These program-level performance data are used in conjunction with institution-set standards in the Program Review process to evaluate college programs. The standards provide a framework for discussing expectations on performance and for identifying opportunities for improvement at the program level (see discussion in the following sections).

In the current cycle of program review, the College Planning Council used the college’s three-year historical average as the basis for establishing the institution-set standard for a measure. [CPC MINUTES] The program review pilot project confirmed the utility of this measure for review and planning purposes. Results from the program review pilot are reported in the following sections and in the SER in the appropriate standard. Results of the college-wide program review process are reviewed annually through the three-year strategic planning cycle. At the end of the strategic planning cycle, the validity of current institution-set standards will be reviewed in the SEMP evaluation process and the results used in the subsequent renewal of the college mission and strategic educational master plan. [Planning Manual]

**Presentation of Student Achievement Data**

At the College level, student achievement data are used to guide institutional evaluation, planning and resource allocation activities. At the program level, student achievement data are used in conjunction with institution-set standards to evaluate program performance, identify opportunities to improve that performance and to allocate resources based on evaluation results. Disaggregation of data help to guide the planning process to develop focused actions that address college and student needs. A summary of college-level, disaggregated and program-level data are provided in the following sections.

**College-level Student Achievement Data, Analysis & Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Completion Rate</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Completion Rate</td>
<td>June 2016*</td>
<td>June 2016*</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE completion rate</td>
<td>June 2016*</td>
<td>June 2016*</td>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Transfers</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The CCCCO’s IEPI reporting requires the college to establish standards and goals for student achievement measures identified in the framework. Harbor will establish these goals in June 2016.

**Data Element** | **Definition of the measure**
--- | ---
Course Completion Rate | Percentage of students who received a grade of “C” or better based on all students who received a grade.
Program Completion Rate | Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students tracked for six years through who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes
CTE completion rate | Percentage of students completing more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education (or apprenticeship) in a single discipline tracked for six
College-level data provide direction and guidance for institutional planning and are used as a snapshot of college performance in achieving the mission. These data are summarized by the college and published in the College Annual Profile. [College profile citation] Student achievement data are published annually by the State in the Student Success Scorecard. [CCCCO website] Both publications are provided to the college through the college website [Faculty/Staff page] and reviewed annually in presentations to college-wide activities and meetings [Opening Day activities, and other governance presentations]

Measures such as course completion are applied at the program level and are used in the college program review process in conjunction with institution-set standards to evaluate program performance on student achievement data. [Program Review and Planning Manual] College-level measures for student achievement data such as the number of degrees or certificates awarded and program completion rates are used in the mission renewal and strategic planning processes. [SEMP]

Trends in student achievement have been mixed over the last three years. The course completion rate has been declining slightly and is comparable to the District average. [District report: Credit Course Success Rate, fall 2014] Over three years, the number of degrees awarded has been rising while the number of certificates awarded has been declining. At the same time, over three years the College Program Completion rate has fluctuated and is below the state average both college-wide as well as in disaggregated groups.

In spring 2015, these mixed results were examined more closely in a study of completion conducted by the OIE [CITE TIME TO COMPLETION STUDY]. This analysis revealed that the average time to completion for associate’s degrees was 6.0 years and for certificates it was 5.2 years. In addition, 24.8% of degree completers and 21.5% of certificate completers took more than 6 years to complete their programs. In the methodologies used by the Chancellor’s Office to calculate the college program completion rate, students who take more than 6 years to complete their programs are not included in the program completion rate.
The college’s response to these findings was to prioritize student completion for the college in all assessment and planning activities. [CPC Minutes approving completion] The findings guided the revision of the SEMP which includes a measure for on-time completion (Goal 2, Objective 3, Measure 1). In addition, several student “pipeline/momentum point” measures have also been articulated: (1) the number and percent of students completing orientation, assessment and educational plans (Goal 1, Objective 2, Measure 1), (2) the percentage of new students successfully enrolling in and completing at least on English and Math in their first year (Goal 1, Objective 3, Measure 1), and (3) persistence (term to term and year to year; Goal 1, Objective 3, Measure 2). [Planning Task Group documents]

As part of the program review process, any degree or certificate program that does not meet the standard is required to review all course offerings to ensure that students can complete all program requirements in two years [PR 2.0 Completion Module script]. This requirement address the SEMP measure for completion-based class schedules (Goal 1, Objective 1, Measure 3). Additional details about the program evaluation are provided in the Program-level Student Achievement Data section.
## College-level Student Achievement Data Disaggregated, Analysis & Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort Size</td>
<td>Cohort Rate</td>
<td>Cohort Size</td>
<td>Cohort Rate</td>
<td>Cohort Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 years old</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+ years old</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Cohort</strong></td>
<td><strong>893</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,055</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2015 Los Angeles Harbor College Student Success Scorecard; Revision Date: 4/8/2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 years old</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+ years old</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Aid</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGG Only</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL Only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGG+PELL</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LACCD Student Information System, Student & Stud_Credit, Stud_Fees_Collect & Ancy_Loans tables. Retrieved September 9, 2015. Subject to change thereafter. Associate degrees include Associate's in Arts (AA), Associate's in Science (AS), as well as AA & AS for Transfer degrees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Certificates Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 years old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+ years old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Aid</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGG Only</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL Only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Success Rate</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Success Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Distance Education</td>
<td>28,076</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>27,724</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,118</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>30,871</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Transfer Rate</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Transfer Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 years old</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+ years old</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student achievement data are disaggregated by gender, age, and ethnicity and when appropriate or available, additional disaggregation is provided by online, disability status, financial status, foster youth and military status. These results are published annually in the SEMP Fact Book and in the CCCCO’s Student Success Scorecard and disseminated to the college. Disaggregation of student achievement data is used to identify and address achievement gaps among groups. This activity is articulated in SEMP Goal 2, Objective 4 – Increase equity in successful outcomes by identifying achievement gaps and increase in performance of under-performing groups.

Disaggregated data are used in the college’s equity planning activities. The result of these activities identified the following disproportionately impacted groups:

- **Access:** Whites, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Foster Youth
- **Course Completion:** African Americans, Hispanic males, Foster Youth
- **ESL/Basic Skills Completion:** African Americans, Hispanic, DSPS, Females
- **Degree and Certificate Completion:** African American, American Indian, Asian/ Pacific Islander
- **Transfer:** Hispanic, DSPS, Economically Disadvantaged

Harbor’s Student Equity Plan 2014-17 provides the analysis that was done to identify these groups. The Equity Plan details the goals, outcomes and activities that the college has established to address the disproportionately impacted groups. [Student Equity Plan 2014-17] Among the programs developed to address these groups are Harbor Advantage, the college’s first-year experience program, and CHAMPS, designed for all student-Athletes’.

Course completion rates are further disaggregated by delivery method (online) and systematically reviewed in the college Program Review process. The institution-set standard for course completion is applied to online programs and where programs do not meet the standard, they are required to create improvement actions.

### Program-level Student Achievement Data, Analysis & Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Program-level Analysis Results</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>SEMP Measure</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
<th>Three-yr Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts Degrees</td>
<td>20% meet standard (2/10)</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Science Degrees</td>
<td>14%% meet standard (3/22)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate for Transfer Degrees</td>
<td>100% meet standard (1/1)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>22% meet standard (4/18)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office MIS Data Mart
Course Completion 59% meet standard (48/81) 65% 2.2.3 65.9% 66.8% 66.8% 66.5%
Course Completion - Online NN% meet standard 65% 2.2.3 56.2% 59.3% 61.1% 58.9%
Licensure Passage Rate - Nursing Meets standard 85% 2.3.2 100% 98.3% 97.1% 98.5%
Licensure Passage Rate - EMT Does not meet standard 60% 2.3.2 57% n/a n/a n/a
Licensure Passage Rate - CNA Meet standard 85% 2.3.2 100% 100% 81% 93.7%
Job Placement Rate NN% meet standard 72.5% 2.3.3 72.8% 69.8% 74.8% 72.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts Degrees</td>
<td>Number of Associate of Arts degrees awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Science Degrees</td>
<td>Number of Associate of Science degrees awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate for Transfer Degrees</td>
<td>Number of Associate for Transfer degrees awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>Number of Chancellor's Office approved certificates awarded (12+ units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Completion</td>
<td>Percentage of students who received a grade of “C” or better based on all students who received a grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Completion - Online</td>
<td>Percentage of students in online courses who received a grade of “C” or better based on all students who received a grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure Passage Rate - Nursing</td>
<td>Passage rate on the NCLEX Nursing licensure exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure Passage Rate - EMT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure Passage Rate - CNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement Rate</td>
<td>Based on Perkins IV Core Indicators of Performance Employment Rate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student achievement data at the program level are provided to the college through the SEMP Fact Book. The Fact Book is published annually and in August 2015 was distributed online to facilitate the use of data in the revised, online program review and planning process. [SEMP Fact Book] These data are reviewed in the annual college-wide program review process [Planning and Program Review Manual].

College operational units and programs use SEMP measures to evaluate their performance in achieving the college mission. The results of this evaluation generate improvement activities that are recorded in HAPS to organize and track the program review, planning and resource allocation processes. The results of these processes are distributed to appropriate governance, administrative and operational groups and individuals for management and oversight. [HAPS documentation]

In the Pilot program, the use of institution-set standards to evaluate program-level performance established an assessment-based framework for analyzing college performance. The assessment results in degree completion identify the concentration of high-producing programs: 10% of degrees produce 80% of the awards. The majority of college programs do not meet the degree or certificate standard. For course completion, the distribution of results is more even; 41% of programs do not meet the standard. For employment data and licensure passage rates, initial results will be reported in Winter 2016.

Where there are institution-set standards for SEMP measures, all units and programs that do not meet the standard are required to generate improvement activities. For each measure there are data-analysis scripts available for units to use for further understanding of evaluation results. These scripts guide units and programs through additional disaggregated data at both the student and course level.
The disaggregated data give the college, units and programs additional evidence to use in the planning and resource allocation processes.

The Program Review Pilot process has confirmed the validity of these results and the college-wide process in spring 2016 will evaluate all units and programs using institution-set standards. [Future CPC Action?] These results will be used to generate unit plans and track the request and allocation of resources.

### Other College-level and Program-level Data, Analysis & Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Institution Standard</th>
<th>SEMP Measure</th>
<th>SEMP Target</th>
<th>2014/2015</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>Three Year Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate - 30 units</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-to-year persistence rate</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation – Assessment</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation – Orientation</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation – SEP</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The CCCCO’s IEPI reporting requires the college to establish standards and goals for student achievement measures identified in the framework. Harbor will establish these goals in June 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Definition of the measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-to-year persistence rate</td>
<td>Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer- seeking students tracked for six year who enrolled in the first three consecutive terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate - 30 units</td>
<td>Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer- seeking students tracked for six years who achieved at least 30 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation – Assessment</td>
<td>Percentage of new eligible students completing the assessment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation – Orientation</td>
<td>Percentage of new eligible students completing orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation – SEP</td>
<td>Percentage of new eligible students completing an abbreviated student educational plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SEMP identifies additional measures that implement the college mission and are essential elements in achieving student success. Using best practices established by the college’s participation in ATD and other state-supported efforts (SSSP, IEPI), the SEMP includes measures that assess a student’s progress in achieving successful outcomes. Recognizing the critical nature of a new student’s transition to college, measures for completion of orientation, assessment and educational planning processes help the college to deliver appropriate services (Goal 1, Objective 2, Measure 1). Persistence from year to year (Goal 1, Objective 3, Measure 2) and accumulation of 30 units (Goal 2, Objective 2, Measure 1) identify and measure additional vital momentum points in a student’s progress to successful outcomes.

Measures for persistence are improving but below the state average of 71.7%. Completion of 30 units performance is similar to the state average of 66.5%. Completion of orientation, assessment and education planning performance is COMPARE TO DISTRICT.

In response to these results, the College has developed several college wide initiatives to address the needs of new and continuing students, including Harbor Advantage, Harbor Success and CHAMPS—Challenging Athletes” Minds for Personal Success. Many of these activities are part of the college’s SSSP and ATD plans. [SSSP Plan and ATD documents]
To facilitate unit planning, Student Services and other units of the college review appropriate SEMP measures to identify program needs and accompanying improvement activities. These activities are recorded in HAPS and results distributed to the appropriate college governance, administrative and operational personnel. The Program Review Pilot process has confirmed the validity of these results and all Student Services units will participate in the college-wide process in spring 2016. [Future CPC Action]
Organization of the Self Evaluation Process

Los Angeles Harbor College is an accredited two-year institution that is authorized to grant associate and transfer degrees and certificates and provide workforce development for the Los Angeles South Bay community. The 2015-2016 accreditation cycle has given Harbor College an opportunity to sustain its campus-wide culture of accreditation. Sustaining this culture means clarifying accreditation principles and how meeting each standard specifically contributes to student success and the overall improvement of the college. In Harbor’s past accreditation cycles, the self-evaluation process invigorated the campus for the life of that specific cycle but then moved to the background as the college settled back into fulfilling its “normal” educational mission and responsibilities. Harbor College’s 2015-16 self-evaluation cycle has placed a stronger emphasis on data and a more thorough integration of assessment, review, and improvement into all aspects of college work. This accreditation cycle has sustained the college’s ongoing practices and at the same time, created a new “normal” in support of stronger communication and sustained college-wide improvement.

Harbor College’s last comprehensive evaluation and site visit for the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) occurred in 2012. As a result of that report and visit the college was placed on Probation with two recommendations regarding planning and budget. The college submitted a 2013 Follow-up Report that demonstrated a more complete alignment between planning and budget. This alignment is specifically evidenced in the area of human resources where the cost of all personnel hires are reflected in and supported by the budget. The campus visit for the 2013 Follow-Up Report verified that the college had adequately responded to the commission’s recommendations. As a result, in July 2013 the ACCJC lifted all sanctions, removed the college from probationary status, and affirmed its accreditation status.

In 2014-15 Harbor College was required to submit a 2015 Mid-term Report as part of the Commission’s regular accreditation timetable. The 2015 Mid-term Report affirmed the college’s sustained efforts on planning and budget, documented its close and continued monitoring of human resource costs, and updated the progress made on the Actionable Improvement Items from the 2012 self-study. The ACCJC accepted the mid-term report, no visit to the campus was required, and college’s accreditation was affirmed.

Simultaneous to the organizing and writing of the 2015 Mid-term Report, the college also began preparations for a 2016 comprehensive evaluation. The timing of the comprehensive report resulted from an ACCJC decision to align all nine campuses in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) on the same assessment cycle. Throughout the mid-term and full evaluation cycle an Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) was in place to oversee the writing of the 2015 Mid-term Report and to conduct the campus-wide study for the upcoming 2016 comprehensive report.

In order to streamline and encourage campus participation in the accreditation process the ASC recommended that the self-study be organized within the college’s existing shared governance committees. Rather than form distinct standard committees or teams, the ASC recommended that the self-evaluation study would be conducted within the ongoing work of college committees with the clear understanding that accreditation topics would hold a standing item on each committee’s monthly agenda. The Chair of each standing committee served as an accreditation co-chair along with an administrator appointed by the CEO. Membership on the committees was scrutinized to assure
representation from faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators. An accreditation coordinator was appointed to each team along with a research analyst from the Office of Institutional to supply their research expertise. In the case of Standard IIB-Library and Learning Support Services, a specific team that represented a cross section of the college, was organized because there is no standing committee specifically assigned to that area. In its recommendation to the College Planning Council (CPC) and the faculty Senate the ASC recommended this model to further integrate accreditation awareness into the institution, reinvigorate the communication within the shared governance committees, and produce a comprehensive evaluation of the college. This organizational structure was approved by both the CPC and the Senate. (Institutional Effectiveness Portal).

In 2015 the ASC affirmed the appointment of three faculty accreditation coordinators, one who had long term experience with accreditation, one who had participated in the process since 2011, and a newer faculty member in training. All three were placed on a 0.40 re-assigned time. In summer 2015 because of external circumstances the newer faculty member resigned leaving the two coordinators. One of these coordinators serves as the co-chair of the ASC along with the ALO who is the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. In July 2015 the Vice-President of Academic Affairs retired and an interim vice-president was appointed who then assumed the ALO duties and co-chair of the ASC. The ASC meets weekly to oversee the evaluation process and insure reporting from the assigned committees.

The 2016 accreditation self-evaluation process began in January 2015. Within the shared governance committees the various topics designated within the accreditation standards were presented and discussed. Harbor College’s committee membership is listed below:

**Standard Committee Membership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Responsible Committee (Click for Membership)</th>
<th>Standard Chair</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Ellen Joiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard I.A</td>
<td>College Planning Council</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard I.B</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, William Hernandez</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Priscilla Lopez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard I.C</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, William Hernandez</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Priscilla Lopez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II.A</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Jim Stanbery</td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston, Sandra Sanchez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II.B</td>
<td>Standard IIB Team</td>
<td>Jonathan Lee</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II.C</td>
<td>Student Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton, Elizabeth Colocho</td>
<td>Mercy Yanez, Corey Rodgers</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.A</td>
<td>Human Resources Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Andrew Sanchez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.B</td>
<td>Work Environment Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>Andrew Sanchez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.C</td>
<td>Technology Advisory Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Ivan Clark, Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson- Alston</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.D</td>
<td>Budget Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa, Nabeel Barakat</td>
<td>Sandra Sanchez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.A</td>
<td>College Planning Council</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.B</td>
<td>President’s Cabinet</td>
<td>Otto Lee</td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.C</td>
<td>LACCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.D</td>
<td>LACCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix A for full committee membership lists.
In many instances committee members were assigned specific sub-standards to investigate, gather evidence, and report back to the committee. Because this external research that was conducted outside of the committees and reported back it is difficult to note all of the individuals who contributed to this study. In addition to committee meetings, phone calls, e-mail requests, and evidence searches engaged people across the campus and contributed to this study. (Attendance sheets) The Institutional Effectiveness Office of the LACCD provided district-wide information and supporting evidence. Initial drafts of the standards and the evidence were placed on SharePoint where they could be read and edited both on campus and from an external site. The timeline for the report is below:

**Evidence:**
- [Institutional Effectiveness Portal](#)
Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Functional Maps

- **District-College Functional Map**

- **Division: Board of Trustees**
  - Unit: Board of Trustees

- **Division: CFO/Treasurer**
  - Unit: Accounting – Accounts Payable, Central Financial Aid, and Payroll
  - Unit: Budget & Management Analysis
  - Unit: CFO/Treasurer
  - Unit: Internal Audit

- **Division: Deputy Chancellor**
  - Unit: ADA Compliance
  - Unit: Business Services
  - Unit: Diversity Programs and Services
  - Unit: Information Technology

- **Division: Economic and Workforce Development**
  - Unit: Workforce Development

- **Division: Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness**
  - Unit: Institutional Effectiveness
  - Unit: Educational Support Services

- **Division: Facilities Planning and Development**
  - Unit: Bond Programs
  - Unit: Real Estate Program

- **Division: Human Resources**
  - Unit: Human Resources

- **Division: Office of the Chancellor**
  - Unit: Office of the Chancellor

- **Division: Personnel Commission**
  - Unit: Personnel Commission

- **Division: The Office of the General Counsel**
  - Unit: General Counsel
Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority
The institution is authorized or licensed to operate as a postsecondary educational institution and to award degrees by an appropriate governmental organization or agency as required by each of the jurisdictions or regions in which it operates.

Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) is a two-year community college operating under the authority of the State of California Education Code, Division 7, which establishes the California Community College system under the leadership and direction of the Board of Governors. The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Board of Trustees recognizes LAHC as one of the nine colleges operating in the District. The Accrediting Commission of the Community and Junior Colleges and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges have continuously accredited the College since it received initial accreditation in 1949. Los Angeles Harbor College is currently accredited through 2016.

Evidence:
• ACCJC Letter, June 2015

2. Operational Status
The institution is operational, with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

LAHC was established in 1949 and has operated continuously since then. Student enrollment has remained consistent for the past five years, with 10,059 students enrolled in fall 2014. The College awarded 843 degrees and certificates in the 2013-14 academic year, an increase of 150 over the previous year. The number of associate’s degrees increased by 147; there was a decline in the number of certificates awarded.

Evidence:
•

3. Degrees
A substantial portion of the institution’s educational offerings are programs that lead to degrees, and a significant proportion of its students are enrolled in them. At least one degree program must be of two academic years in length.

The College offers 43 degrees in associate of arts, associate of science, and associate degrees for transfer; and 26 certificates of achievement. (Source: 2014-16 LAHC General Catalog) A student
enrolled full-time can generally complete the degree requirements in two academic years. The College has 626 active courses. (Source: Curriculum Committee Chair, list as of 10-10-2015) In fall 2014, Los Angeles Harbor College offered 945 sections affiliated with credit instructional programs, in over 22 disciplines, ninety-six percent (907) of which were identified as “degree-applicable.” In fall 2012, there were 27,945 enrollments; 96 percent of those enrollments were in courses leading to a degree or certificate. In fall 2013, there were 29,460 enrollments; 96 percent were in courses leading to a degree or certificate. Of the 28,723 enrollments in the fall 2014, 96 percent were enrollments in courses leading to a degree or certificate.

All degrees consist of units required for the major or area of emphasis, general education, and degree-applicable elective units to reach the 60 unit minimum as required in LACCD Board Rules 6201.10, 6201.13 and 6201.14. Degrees and certificates consist of a core of required courses in a single field of study allowing for depth of the subject. For associate degrees, student must complete a minimum of 18 units of general education providing a breadth of knowledge outside of the focused major.

Evidence:

- SIS Student_Enrollment and Course_Section, 09-18-2015; excludes non-ADA generating sections
  (NOTE: Enrollment = duplicated, graded enrollment; includes credit and non-credit enrollment)

4. Chief Executive Officer
The institution has a chief executive officer appointed by the governing board, whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, and who possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. Neither the district/system chief executive officer nor the institutional chief executive officer may serve as the chair of the governing board. The institution informs the Commission immediately when there is a change in the institutional chief executive officer.

Dr. Otto Lee was appointed President of Los Angeles Harbor College by the governing board of the Los Angeles Community College District at its June 25, 2014 meeting with an effective date of August 1, 2015. The governing board approved the president’s contract through June 30, 2017

Authority to operate the College and administer board policies is given to the president in Board Rule 9802, which states: “The president of the college or his/her authorized representative shall enforce the Board Rules and Administrative Regulations pertaining to campus conduct and may develop guidelines, apply sanctions, or take appropriate action consistent with such rules and regulations.” Dr. Lee is a full-time administrator and does not serve on the governing board of the District. LAHC is aware of its responsibility to immediately notify the Accrediting Commission when there is a change in the chief executive officer appointment and has done so at each leadership change.

Evidence:

- (Board Agenda HRD1 page 23; Board Minutes page 4).
- LACCD Board Rule 9002 – pshare ID 811

5. Financial Accountability
The institution annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant or an audit by an appropriate public agency. Institutions that are already Title IV eligible must demonstrate compliance with federal requirements.

Annual external financial audits by a certified public accountant are conducted of the Los Angeles Community College District. Los Angeles Harbor College is not audited as a separate entity. The governing board reviews these reports in a regularly scheduled meeting during public session, which includes discussion of management responses to any exceptions. The District files audit reports with the Los Angeles County Department of Education and any other public agencies as required.

An independent firm conducts audits of the LACCD financial aid programs on an annual basis. The most recent audit of the LAHC program was during the 2014-2015 academic year. There were no findings in the 2014-2015 as a result of the audit. The LACCD produces a report called the Basic Financial Statements and Supplemental Information Audit Reports at the end of each audit period. LAHC had a site visit during the last audit cycle.

LAHC default rates fall within the acceptable range. The College’s three-year cohort default rates during the last cohort years were under the Department of Education’s 30 percent threshold. No default management plan was required. The 2012 cohort default rates were 21.4 percent; in 2011, the default rates were 16.4 percent; and, in 2010, the cohort default rates were 11.6 percent. Additional information regarding the LAHC’s compliance with Title IV federal regulations can be found in the College’s response to the Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV.

Evidence:

Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Commission Policies

(Note: Work continues on compiling the data and information for this section.)

The ACCJC provides a checklist for evaluating the status of the College in terms of the requirements described in federal regulations and Commission policies.

Public Notification of an Evaluation visit and Third Party Comment

Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions

Regulation citation: 602.23b

1. The institution has made appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.

2. The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.

3. The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party comment.

Evidence:

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

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

(See Standards I.A.2, I.B.5, I.B.7)

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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 are results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.

4. 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.

Evidence:
Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits

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

(See ER 3, Standards II.A.5, II.A.6, II.A.9)

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

2. 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 involved clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).

3. Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

4. Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education’s conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.

5. The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits.

Evidence:

Policy on Transfer of Credit

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

(see Standard II.A.10)

1. Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.

2. Policies contain information about criteria the institution uses to accept credits of transfer.

3. The Institution complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit.

Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education

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

1. The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.

Courses are identified by disciple faculty including the method of instruction. The proposed DE designated courses are approved by the curriculum committee.

Evidence:

https://effectiveness.lahc.edu/academic_senate/curriculum/Committee%20Documents/Distance%20Education%20Addendum%20Form.pdf

2. The 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).

As defined by the faculty contract, distance learning is a formal mode of interaction which uses
one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the
instructor and which supports regular and substantive interaction between the students and
instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The same quality standards applied to face-
to-face courses shall also apply to DL courses.

Evidence: Agreement Between the LACCD and the LAC Faculty Guild Article 40. A.1 & A.3
Contract: Appendix C-Section II, page 191
Student evaluation of Online Instructor, page 216
(Art. 40. A1. & 3)

3. 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 the student information is protected.

   All end-user interaction with ETUDES is SSL encrypted (HTTPS). All accounts are password
protected, and users have specific permissions and roles in the course site. While the instructor
has access to see and edit grades, students in the class do not – other than to see their own
grades.

   ETUDES uses unique user names and passwords, as well as institutional identification #s
(student id’s and employee id’s for faculty and email address to create a fuller profile per user).
All of this information is checked upon login attempts to ensure that the appropriate user is
authorized to gain access to the right sites, as per the institutional registrations uploaded
securely onto ETUDES from Registrar’s Data.

Evidence: ETUDES privacy policy: http://ETUDES.org/privacy-statement/

4. The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and
correspondence education offerings.

   The college relies on a third party vendor (ETUDES) to host and provide related services that
are adequate for maintaining and sustaining its DE course offerings.

Evidence:

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

   LAHC distance education provides student services similar to those offered by the college for
face to face students. Additionally, the college complies with the state authorization policy to
only offer classes to those students with which their residence state has authorized

Evidence: http://www.lahc.edu/harboronline.html

Policy on Representation of Accredited Status

Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions
1. 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.

2. The student complaints files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.

3. The team analysis of student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.

4. The institution post on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.

5. The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Representation of Accredited Status and the Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions.

Evidence:

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Policy on Institution Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status
Policy on Representation of Accredited Status

Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6

(See Standard I.C.2)

1. The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.

2. The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Institution Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status.

3. The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described about in the section on Student Complaints.

Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations

Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV

Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq (see ER 5, Standards II.B.4; III.D.5-7, 10, 14-16)

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. The institution’s student loan default rates are within in acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
4. Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive education, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.

5. The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission

List of Contracts with Third-Party Providers and Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations
(In progress)
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. (ER 6)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. The Los Angeles Harbor College mission statement is as follows:
   “Los Angeles Harbor College promotes access and student success through associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction. Our educational programs and support services meet the needs of diverse communities as measured by campus institutional learning outcomes.”

b. The mission statement specifies the college’s educational purposes (“promote access and student success”), its intended student population (“the college’s diverse community”), the types of degrees and other credentials it offers (“associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction”). The college’s ongoing assessment of its institutional learning outcomes (1) Communication, 2) Cognition, 3) Information Competency and 4) Social Responsibility in a Diverse World further affirm the college’s commitment to student learning and achievement.

c. The College determines its intended population through a variety of methods. On an annual basis, the College analyzes area demographics along with job data and employment trends to determine which programs or services the community needs. This data is also published in the SEMP Fact Book where they can be accessed by the entire campus.

d. The college mission is discussed at campus committees, professional and staff development activities, SLO training seminars, and programs for College opening day activities. These discussion show continual and increasing dialogue among key College constituents regarding the relevance of the Mission Statement to student learning. 93% of respondents in the 2015 LAHC Campus Climate Survey either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the college “provides me with information about its mission.” SURVEY LINK

Analysis and Evaluation:

The institution’s educational mission is clearly defined, adopted, and published by its governing board consistent with its legal authorization, and is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and the constituency it seeks to serve. The mission is also the primary focus of the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) and is systematically assessed through an ongoing evaluation of institutional learning outcomes. The college regularly reviews its mission statement to insure its relevance. The College meets this standard. (ER6)

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:

a. The Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) establishes the standards through which the mission may be evaluated with assessment data. The goals of the SEMP have been aligned with the LACCD goals and also reflect the institution-set standards specified in state and federal requirements. [College Strategic Educational Master Plan]

b. The college has piloted the Harbor Assessment-Based Planning System (HAPS) in fall 2015. HAPS is a streamlined assessment process that places the mission at the center of all assessment and planning activities and integrates ongoing assessment with program review, unit planning, and resource allocation.

c. College-wide evaluation of the mission has been improved through the implementation of SharePoint software that makes data more accessible and useable. This new data sharing system ensures that the information on which these decisions are based identifies disaggregated groups of students including cohorts specially selected and tracked. [SharePoint processing examples]

Analysis and Evaluation:

After evaluating its planning processes in 2014, in 2015-16 the college revised its planning procedures, providing for stronger clarification of the college mission and alignment of college goals and activities within it. Harbor College’s Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS) ties assessment to the SEMP and to program review. A series of orientation workshops were held throughout fall 2015 to provide specific instruction on the system. At the completion of the pilot the results will be validated and the process will be evaluated. After vetting by the shared governance bodies the process will be incorporated into the Program Review Policy and Procedures Manual. The College meets this standard.

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:

a. The college’s programs and services are aligned with the college mission (“promote access and student success”) through the SEMP which includes four goals: 1) access and preparation for success, 2) teaching and learning for success, 3) organizational effectiveness, and 4) resources and collaborations. These serve as the guiding standards for institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation. All other college plans are directly aligned [See planning diagram below].

b. For example, in order to insure that all hiring is done within the context of the mission, the hiring request form submitted to the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC) requires that
each hiring request be aligned with the mission (Request for Position Form). In order to increase transfer degrees (an important part of the college’s mission) FHPCC prioritized and recommended the hiring of a Transfer counselor. Similarly, to address basic skills instruction (another part of the mission) the Math Department was authorized to hire two additional math instructors to support math basic skills. FHPCC also prioritized a Nursing position to address the college’s mission of workforce development and address the needs of the Nursing program.

c. Grant monies designated for workforce development have contributed to and provided for basic skills instruction. For example the STEM grant has provided instruction and support for basic skills. (STEM Presentation)

d. The Academic Senate and its Curriculum subcommittee along with the Academic Affairs Cluster oversees curriculum development and programs that sustain associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction. Student Services and Administrative Services plan (in particular, the annual Facilities and IT Plans) provide services and resources that support all academic endeavors and insure their success.

e. Alignment of the college mission with institutional goals for learning and achievement is evidenced by the college’s ongoing development of programs and services. In 2012-15 Harbor College developed four AS-T and four AA-T degrees. (Associate Degree and Certificates of Achievement). Support services have also expanded to promote access as well as student success (Harbor Advantage Program).

f. The Mission Statement makes no specific reference to on-line instruction because DE classes, like traditional classes, are determined through the College planning process, in which all College constituencies are represented in accordance with the College Participatory Governance Agreement and the College Planning Policy and Procedures Manual.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard because the four goals of the SEMP align all college programs (academic, student services, and administrative services) within the mission. Fulfilling and assessing the specific measures within the SEMP provide the process for evaluating the college’s effectiveness in meeting its institutional goals and the broader mission for student learning and achievement.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. The college articulates and widely publicizes its mission in the college catalogue and schedule. It is also posted on the college homepage, in numerous locations around the campus, and is part of all governance committee agenda templates. Faculty are encouraged to include the mission statement on their syllabi, their DE (distance education) homepages, and as part of their email signature statements.

b. Review of the college’s mission statement was initiated by the College Planning Council (CPC) in fall 2014. The new mission statement: “Los Angeles Harbor College promotes access and student success through associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction. Our educational programs and support services meet the needs of diverse communities as measured by campus institutional learning outcomes.” replaces Harbor’s 2012-15 mission statement that read: “Los Angeles Harbor College fosters learning through comprehensive programs that meet the educational needs of the community as measured by student success, personal and institutional accountability, and integrity.”

c. Based on input from the various college constituencies, CPC decided that the increased specificity of the revised mission statement better reflects the educational focus of the college and its institutional commitment to student learning and achievement. Because the college does not distinguish between distance education (DE) and traditional classes (other than delivery mode) the Mission Statement makes no specific reference to on-line instruction. [CPC minutes]

d. After CPC approval the revised mission statement was submitted to the LACCD Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee on March 25, 2015 and for full approval by the LACCD Board of Trustees on April 15, 2015. [LACCD Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee minutes; Board minutes]

e. A concerted effort has been made to assess campus wide awareness of the content and relevance of the Mission Statement. According to the 2015 College Campus Climate Survey, 90.3 percent of those responding “agreed strongly” or “agreed” that the College “provides me with information about its mission”, and 79.2 percent of survey participants were “very aware” or “aware” of the College goals, and the top three goals of the College aligned with the goals identified by respondents as their top three. [Sample committee agenda templates; latest Campus Climate Survey results]

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college regularly reviews, revises, and publishes its mission statement, and the current statement clearly reflects the college’s commitment to student access and achievement. Assessing the mission through the SEMP is integrated into the college’s planning and procedural processes and ensures that assessment data is now used to evaluate the mission. The college meets this standard. (ER6)
Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

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:

a. In order to more formally structure and sustain a substantive dialogue geared toward student achievement, the college has revised and streamlined its processes into Harbor’s Assessment-Based Planning System (HAPS).

b. Prior to these revisions, dialogue on student outcomes, equity, and academic quality were conducted primarily at the discipline or unit level. A program assessed its designated SLOs or SAOs, reviewed the assessment data, and developed “use of results” strategies that were then implemented and re-assessed. After reviewing recommendations from the 2013 CPC Planning Evaluation regarding institutional effectiveness, the College Planning Council (CPC) determined that the assessment and planning process needed better coordination and integration. CPC then authorized the formation of a planning taskforce in spring/summer 2015.

c. The taskforce reviewed the CPC evaluation and then explored ways to address its recommendations (Planning Evaluation Report, 2012-13). The taskforce recommended several revisions to the ongoing process that would (1) bring the mission front and center of the planning process; (2) align the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) with the college mission and LACCD goals; (3) base the SEMP on specific goals that may be measured with the ongoing assessment process; (4) link assessment outcomes, program review, and unit planning with resource allocations; and (5) adopt a three year planning cycle to allow all units to implement the SEMP and to assess their programs based upon its measures.

d. CPC approved the development of Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS) a pilot project conducted in fall 2015 with eight programs. During the pilot, eight programs were trained in the process of program review based upon assessment results, its link to the mission, and familiarized with the SharePoint software, the tool for instituting these organizational changes. CPC will review the results of the pilot after the fall semester in time for other programs to participate in a full review in spring 2016.

e. The shift to assessment based planning refocuses the college dialogue away from what, in many instances had been disparate and localized conversations, toward the common goal of student improvement, achieving the mission, and overall institutional effectiveness.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college meets this standard by articulating the mission through the SEMP now places overall institutional effectiveness at the center of assessment dialog and planning. The HAPS gives the college
a measureable framework to evaluate student outcomes, equity, academic quality, and the strengths and weaknesses of the college’s efforts toward student achievement.

**Standard I.B.2**
The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. *(ER 11)*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. Faculty and staff have defined course, program, and institutional outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. College personnel assess SLOs and SAOs on a systematic schedule. With the revised HAPS system all outcomes are also aligned with SEMP and the college mission. Student achievement data is disaggregated by relevant demographic and delivery methods. *(SEMP Factbook 19)*

b. The HAPS is being piloted with several programs (to be completed in fall 2015) and the entire college in spring 2016. This model further integrates the assessment and planning processes with allocation of resources. This renewed link between assessment, planning, and resources brings stronger coherence to the assessment process and contributes to stronger “buy-in” from faculty and staff.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The college defines standards for student achievement and assesses both student and service area outcomes. The student learning and program-specific outcomes are published and assessment results and strategic improvements are integrated into program review and unit planning. The college meets this standard. *(ER11)*

**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. *(ER 11)*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. In 2014-15, the College refocused on institution-set standards by incorporating the standards into the SEMP, which places them as the key measures for program review, unit planning, and resource allocation *(SEMP Factbook 20)*. The SEMP integration focuses the ongoing assessment processes toward evaluating how the college is performing on key measures. These measures include Goal 1: Access and Preparation for Success; Goal 2: Teaching and Learning for Success; Goal 3: Organizational Effectiveness; and Goal 4: Resources and Collaboration. Integrating institution set standards into the SEMP allows the college to determine how well the college is accomplishing its mission.

b. DE programs and courses are a part of the program review process and are evaluated with the same standards and measures as traditional programs. The goals and objectives of DE
programs are no different than traditional programs. Courses with both types of delivery are assessed in terms of how they address the institution-set standards.

c. This information is compiled and distributed widely across the campus in the Annual College Profile. The Profile lists the key measures and clarifies where the college stands on these indicators.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The dialogue around set standards has significantly deepened and broadened. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness explained the College Scorecard at the Academic Senate and the CPC along with its implications for assessment and planning. The Scorecard and in particular the completion standard was also discussed college wide at both Opening Day activities. Formulating the SEMP on set standards with has clarified the college’s understanding of continuous improvement and insures that students who complete programs, no matter how or where they are offered, achieve the identified outcomes. The set standards keep the college focused on the mission and provide the tools for its evaluation. The updating of the software to report assessment data has contributed to its increased accessibility and use by faculty and staff. The college meets this standard. (ER 11)

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:

a. The institution’s mission is articulated by the SEMP whose measures drive college goals and resource allocation. Student achievement data is disaggregated according to the state-required Equity Plan which allows the college to identify those groups that are disproportionately affected.

b. The SEMP establishes the college priorities, provides its data measurement, and the framework for program review. Based on analysis of the data, units identify areas for improvement and develop plans based on those improvements.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard by incorporating assessment data into its institutional program review and unit planning processes. Through the SEMP this process directly aligns data with the district and college goals and provides the tools to measure student learning and achievement.

Institutional Effectiveness

Standard I.B.5

50
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:

a. The college assesses its mission through its use of the Harbor Assessment-based Planning system (HAPS). This system uses data provided in the SEMP Fact book and guides college programs through a series of questions organized into Modules about student achievement, learning and other measures identified in the SEMP.

b. Questions within the Modules are based on institution-set standards or other performance measures established by federal, state, or district requirements that are included in the SEMP.

c. When working through the Modules programs use assessment data to formulate program review results and to develop and record improvement actions that address any results that not meet standards or other requirements. Improvement actions coming out of these results form the basis of the yearly unit plan.

d. In the pilot cycle (fall 2015), unit plans will be validated through administrative review and validated plans are the basis of the annual resource allocation process.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard with its revised and implemented assessment-based planning system (HAPS). HAPS aligns the goals of the College mission with those of the LACCD and establishes measurable criteria for these goals within the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). Assessment results are measured with the goals of the SEMP, and if improvement is warranted the strategies for improvement become the basic elements of program review. Areas that are identified by assessment data as needing improvement are noted in the program review which then correlate with the unit plan which uses this data to justify resources needed for improvement.

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:

a. Student achievement data are disaggregated by gender, age, and ethnicity, and when appropriate or available, additional disaggregation is provided by online, disability status, financial status, foster youth and military status.

b. These results are published annually in the SEMP Factbook and in the CCCCO’s Student Success Scorecard and disseminated to the college. Disaggregation of student achievement
data is used to identify and address achievement gaps among various groups and in the college’s equity planning activities.

c. Equity planning used disaggregated data to identify the following disproportionately impacted groups:
   - Access: Whites, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Foster Youth
   - Course Completion: African Americans, Hispanic males, Foster Youth
   - ESL/Basic Skills Completion: African Americans, Hispanic, DSPS, Females
   - Degree and Certificate Completion: African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander
   - Transfer: Hispanic, DSPS, Economically Disadvantaged

d. The Harbor’s Student Equity Plan 2014-17 provides the analysis that was done to identify these groups. The Equity Plan details the goals, outcomes, and activities that the college has established to address the disproportionately impacted groups. Based on the Equity Plan data, the College implanted several support program including CHAMPS—Challenging Athletes’ Minds for Personal Success—which provide Athletes’ with a counselor, enrichment workshops, a CHAMPS Success Center for individual and group tutoring, and mentoring. More than fifty percent of student Athletes’ fall into a disproportionately impacted demographic as indicated in the Equity data. In addition, the College is implementing an and Emoji program to address the needs of African American students as the Equity data indicates both males and females are disproportionately impacted on several of the Equity measures.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College disaggregates data to identify disproportionately impacted groups. Based upon this data, the College has then developed and funded specific intervention programs to mitigate those gaps. Retention and persistence data from these interventions is promising. The college meets this standard.

---

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:

a. The College undertook a comprehensive review of planning at a Planning Retreat in 2013. Since the Planning Retreat, the College has made several improvements in its policies and practices for regular evaluation:
   - Aligned it goals and measures with those in the District Strategic Master Plan via the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP)
   - Implemented the Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS) that aligns the goals of the College mission and establishes measurable criteria for the goals. HAPS also provides a structure for improvement, tied to program review, for areas identified by assessment data as needing improvement. HAPS affirms the college’s ongoing cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.
Determined through the accreditation process that an action plan identified in the Quality Focus Essay would be to review all the College policy manuals and the charge, mission, and membership of all shared governance committees.

All share governance committees are required, on an annual basis, to complete a committee evaluation, and an electronic version of the evaluation tool was implemented to ensure wide participation of all committee members.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College maintains a regular focus on evaluating its policies and practices to assure its effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishing its mission. A new “systems thinking” planning model will ensure that continuous improvement of instructional programs, support services, resource allocation, and governance processes is a focus for the College. The College meets this standard.

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:

a. Harbor College’s collegial environment encourages an honest examination of data and a shared understanding of the college’s strengths and weaknesses. As part of the College’s effort to establish a climate of accreditation, the campus engaged in four Harbor Success Days in 2013-2014. These events allowed faculty and staff to review accreditation standards in the context of Harbor’s data. In spring 2015, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness presented the College Scorecard in numerous shared governance meetings. The presentation prompted numerous questions and discussions concerning the implications of this data for Harbor College.

b. In establishing the institution-set standards, the Academic Senate and College Planning Council held discussions at several meetings to discuss the data and decide on the standards. These discussions included creating an understanding of the institution-set standards and presentations of the data. Members of the Associated Student Organization participated in the meetings.

c. As of fall 2015, all assessment and evaluation activities are listed at the Effectiveness Portal which utilizes SharePoint technology to organize data in a web-based format. SharePoint ends Word-based documentation that was sometimes lost or inappropriately posted and improves the timeliness of all reporting. This validated data marks a significant step forward by enabling all campus participants to share common data. Various workshops have been provided to train personnel on these improved organizational and documentation techniques.

d. The integration of assessment, program review, and unit planning into one system ensures ongoing communication at all levels of the campus. Plans may be easily updated at any time which stimulates a dialogue around strengths and weaknesses.

Analysis and Evaluation:
The College communicates assessment data via its effectiveness portal, assessment website, and in campus forums and committees. A clearer and more useful organization of this data has enhanced its accessibility. The college meets this standard.

**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. *(ER 19)*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. The planning model below clarifies the college’s process for continuous, broad-based, systematic evaluation and planning. The measures included in the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) include all student achievement measures as well as measures that align with state required and college functional plans. These measures provide a framework for the college-wide program review process and the analysis of program-level student achievement data.

b. SEMP measure analysis results are used to generate improvement actions at the program level. These improvement actions are the basis of the college unit planning and resource allocation processes. All of these activities are organized online in the Harbor Assessment-based planning system (HAPS). HAPS tracks assessment results, unit plans and the request and allocation of resources. Results are summarized for review and oversight by the college administration and shared governance process.
Analysis and Evaluation:
The college systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its mission, including the assessment of student learning outcomes. The Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS) provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement, of educational goals, and student learning. The system also facilitates the assessment of progress toward specific goals or measurements and sustains the systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. The college meets this standard. (ER19)
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. *(ER 20)*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. Los Angeles Harbor College provides clear and accurate information regarding its mission, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. Online and hard copy publications are checked for accuracy and updated on the College website on a regular basis.

b. In summer/fall 2015 the College reorganized its website. The revised site provides greater clarity and accessibility. The use of SharePoint software has also provided better organization and transparency to college postings.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
The College meets this standard by providing clear and accurate information to students, personnel, and the community. The Mission statement, learning outcomes, programs, and student support services are regularly reviewed and updated. *(ER 20)*

**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” (see endnote). *(ER 20)*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. Harbor College publishes an official biennial Catalog and regularly reviews and updates the online version for currency and accuracy. The following information is included:

**General Information**
1) [Official name and address, telephone numbers and Website address](#)
2) [Educational mission](#)
3) [Representation of accredited status with the ACCJC and with programmatic accreditors](#)
4) [Course, program, and degree offerings](#)
5) [Student Learning Outcomes for Programs and Degrees](#) (these are available at the SLO website)
6) Academic Calendar and Program length
7) [Academic Freedom Statement](#)
8) [Available Student Financial Aid](#)
9) [Available Learning Resources](#)
10) [Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty](#)
Requirements
11) Admissions
12) Student Fees and Other Financial Obligations
13) Degrees, Certificates, Graduation, and Transfer

Major Policies Affecting Students
14) Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty
15) Nondiscrimination
16) Acceptance of Transfer Credits
17) Transcripts
18) Grievance and Complaint Procedures
19) Sexual Harassment
20) Refund of Fees

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college meets this standard by providing a print and electronic catalog to the public. The print version is updated every two years but the online version is regularly updated to insure accuracy and currency. (ER20)

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. (ER19)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Evaluations of Harbor College’s assessment of student learning are published on the College website where they may be accessed by students, faculty, and the public (Course SLO Assessment26).

b. As part of its effort to streamline and integrate assessment of student learning into its program review process, student outcomes and results are also entered into the Harbor Assessment - Based Planning System (HAPS)27. Assessment results and improvement strategies may also be viewed at this site.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard by systematically evaluating and publicizing how well and in what ways it accomplishes its purposes, including the assessment of student learning outcomes. The College also meets this standard by providing evidence of planning for improvements by documenting its assessment of student learning and its evaluation of student achievement. This documentation is regularly reviewed, updated, and publicized. The HAPS system implemented in fall 2015 affirms the college’s ongoing cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Appropriate constituencies may openly access the college’s commitment to academic quality. (ER19)
Standard I.C.4
The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes. (Federal Regulation)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. The College describes the purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes on the Title V course outlines that are regularly reviewed and updated in the LACCD’s Electronic Development Curriculum (ECD) site.28

b. The college catalog also describes certificate and degree patterns. A continuous, systematic effort is made by the Curriculum Committee to ensure that degrees and certificates are identified in ways which are consistent with the program content, degree objectives, and student mastery of knowledge and skills including, where appropriate, career preparation and competencies (Curriculum Committee archived minutes).30

c. Faculty of traditional and DE classes are required to list student learning outcomes on each course syllabi. Pursuant to LACCD Board Rule Chapter VI Instruction Article VII 6703.10 (8-15-15) at the beginning of each semester faculty submit their syllabi to their appropriate division chair for review (LACCD Board Rules).31 For DE classes the ETUDES platform includes a syllabus icon for each class that must be loaded and available. DE class evaluators review the syllabus, including learning outcomes, as part of their overall review of the class.

d. At the end of the semester traditional and DE faculty submit the results of that semester’s assessment. These results are reviewed at division meetings (Social & Behavioral Science Division Meetings; Math & Technology Division Meetings; Health Sciences Division Webpage).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Electronic Curriculum Development system enables the College to describe the purpose, content, course requirements, and learning outcomes for courses specific to its certificates and degrees. The patterns required for certification and degrees are then clarified in the college catalog. In order to further clarify and improve on the accuracy of its program listings, the College plans a series of discipline workshops in the fall 2015/spring 2016 to provide opportunity for each program to review and update its degree and certification programs in the college catalog. (Federal Regulation)
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. (Federal Regulation)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. In preparation of its biannual catalog, the College reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure that all representations are correct and up-to-date. More frequent reviews are reflected in online updates.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. In order to sustain improvement and assure a systematic and regular review of all campus representations, the College held several discipline workshops to review and insure the accuracy of program information. Additionally, as part of the College’s quality focus effort to formalize campus-wide communication and professional development, the College will conduct a review of its institutional policy manuals, procedures, and publications. After a comprehensive review, the College will then designate responsibility to an existing committee/committees to sustain the formal review process. (Federal Regulation)

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. (Federal Regulation)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Total cost of education expenses are noted in the Student Fee and Refund Policies section of the course schedule. The schedule is issued every semester and specifies all student fees including tuition for residents and non-residents, health and parking fees. The Associated Student fee and Student Representation fee is also listed (may be waived). The necessity of instructional materials is also noted along with the cost of such materials to be determined by the required coursework (Fall 2015 Schedule of Classes, Pg. 4-635).

b. The course schedule also includes a sample worksheet on which students may calculate the total costs for a semester from the guidelines provided (Fall 2015 Schedule of Classes, Pg. 736).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard by accurately informing all students regarding the total cost of required fees. This information is available to current and prospective students via the print and online schedules and the college catalog. (Federal Regulation)

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. (ER 13)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, Los Angeles Harbor College ascribes to the LACCD Board-approved policy (Chapter XV- 15002-Academic Freedom), Article 4 of the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, Local 1521 CFT/AFT, AFL-CIO (in effect form July 1, 2014-June 30, 2017) further affirms this policy. This article states that, “the Faculty shall have the academic freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning to the students” (College Catalog, p. 737).

b. The Academic Senate of the College has endorsed the code of conduct proposed by the American Association of University Professors and approved by the California State Academic Senate, as well as a plagiarism policy pursuant to the applicable Los Angeles Community Colleges’ board rules and policies stated in the College catalog and schedule of classes.

c. Other than delivery mode, the college does not distinguish between traditional and DE classes. The same policies for academic freedom and responsibility applicable in traditional instruction apply in DE instruction as well.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Los Angeles Harbor College meets this standard and promotes institutional and academic integrity. The institution’s faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic community. The college maintains a professional and collegial atmosphere that upholds intellectual honesty and independence for faculty and students. (ER13)

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. (Federal Regulation)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Los Angeles Harbor College uses and makes public official policies that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity. LACCD Board Rule 9803.12, published in the college schedule clarifies the district and college policy on student academic honesty (Fall 2015 Schedule of Classes, p. 85[38]).
b. The Academic Senate of the College has endorsed the code of conduct proposed by the American Association of University Professors and approved by the California State Academic Senate, as well as a plagiarism policy pursuant to the applicable Los Angeles Community Colleges’ board rules and policies.

c. Policies regarding honesty, responsibility, and integrity for all constituencies are clarified in the faculty handbook and in the college catalog and schedule (Faculty Handbook, p. 28).

d. Orientation sessions for all probationary faculty members cover academic integrity and provide a forum for new faculty to understand and to discuss these issues in relevant classroom situations. Probationary Faculty Orientation Schedules

Analysis and Evaluation:

Los Angeles Harbor College meets this standard by establishing and pursuing clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility, and integrity. The college also clearly defines the consequences for inappropriate student behavior and dishonesty. (Federal Regulation)

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:

a. The Academic Senate ascribes to the ethical position defined by the American Association of University Professors on Professional Ethics.

b. In reviewing course outlines, the Curriculum Committee verifies that official course content and requirements represent officially accepted views while respecting the tight of faculty to express diverse viewpoints.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard and encourages all faculty to present course content as objectively and professionally as possible.

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:

a. As a public community college, specific codes of conduct or policies that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views do not apply.
Analysis and Evaluation:

Los Angeles Harbor College is a public institution so conduct conformity and the teaching of specific beliefs are not appropriate.

**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:**

a. Harbor College does not offer international programs and does not have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.

b. Distance education students from out of state must verify that they are authorized to take classes in California. Students are notified of this requirement at the DE website ([Distance Education Authorizations or Exemptions](#)).

c. The website of the Office of International Students provides information for foreign students. The office director reviews applications to insure that foreign students comply with the college’s admission requirements.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Harbor College does not offer international programs. Out-of-state and foreign students are monitored to insure that they are authorized to enroll in college classes or programs. The college meets this standard.

**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. *(ER 21) (Federal Regulation)*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. Los Angeles Harbor College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC). ([ACCJC Directory of Accredited Institutions](#)).

b. All documentation regarding the college’s self-evaluation process in the past and present is published and accessible to the college community and to the public. This documentation demonstrates the college’s honesty and integrity in the self-evaluation process and its timely response to all Commission requirements ([Accreditation Steering Committee Webpage](#)).
Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard and agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure and reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive change. The college responds and discloses information in a timely manner to all Commission requests. (ER21) (Federal Regulation)

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. (ER 21) (Federal Regulation)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. The Academic Senate and the College Planning Council (CPC) review all communication with external agencies to assure that the College demonstrates honesty and integrity and complies with regulations and statutes. The College is consistent in its description to all accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public.

b. The LACCD Board of Trustees Committee on Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation monitors College accreditation processes, reviews all Accreditation Self Evaluation reports to assure that they comply with Commission guidelines, and monitors progress toward implementation of all accreditation recommendations. http://www.laccd.edu/_layouts/OSSSearchResults.aspx?k=Institutional%20Effectiveness&cs=This%20Site&u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.laccd.edu

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard and with the oversight of the LACCD Board of Trustees Committee on Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation and the college Academic Senate and CPC demonstrate honestly and integrity in its relationships with external agencies including compliance with regulations and statutes. The College complies with Commission requests, directives, decisions, and policies. The college’s disclosure and descriptions are consistent to all. (ER 21) (Federal Regulation)

Standard I.C.14
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:

a. The College Mission Statement, the Strategic Educational Master Plan specify the goals and objectives that implement the Mission Statement.; All other college plans providing the
activities that implement the SEMP make the priorities of the College clear and document how they are measured. The four College goals: 1) Access and Preparation, 2) Teaching and Learning for Success, 3) Organizational Effectiveness, and 4) Resources and Collaboration document that student access and achievement are paramount to all college priorities and planning.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College meets this standard. The College mission and the Strategic Educational Master Plan demonstrate the institution’s primary commitment to student learning and success.
Standard I.C Evidence:

I.C.1
I.C.1 – LAHC College Website

I.C.2
I.C.2 - College Catalog
I.C.3 - Schedule of Classes

I.C.3
I.C.4 - SLO assessment results
I.C.5 - College Website

I.C.4
I.C.6 - Accuracy review file
I.C.7 - Office of Academic Affairs
I.C.8 - Course syllabi file
I.C.9 - Discipline assessment review meeting minutes
I.C.10 - College Catalog
I.C.11 - Schedule of Classes

I.C.5
I.C.12 - Accuracy review file
I.C.13 - Office of Academic Affairs

I.C.6
I.C.14 - College Schedule of Classes

I.C.7
I.C.15 - DL Substantive Change Proposal
I.C.16 - Office of Academic Affairs

I.C.8
I.C.17 - Faculty Handbook

I.C.9

I.C.10

I.C.11
I.C.18 - DL Substantive Change Proposal
I.C.19 - Office of Academic Affairs

I.C.12
I.C.20 - ACCJC Letter about 2015 Mid-Term Report
I.C.21 - 2015 Mid-Term Report
I.C.22 - ACCJC Letter of Affirmation of Accreditation
I.C.23 - 2013 Follow-Up Report
I.C.24 - LA Harbor Follow-Up 2013 Team Report
I.C.26 - 2012 Self Evaluation Study
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. (ER 9 & 11)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. All instructional programs (including both traditional and distance education (DE) classes are defined by the goals of higher education and in support of the college mission (“promote access and student success through associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction”). Classes within a specific instructional program are offered because they lead to a degree or certificate, for employment, or transfer.

b. The majority of the college’s courses are offered in a traditional classroom format (fall 2014-837 sections). That same semester the college offered 98 DE sections. [Fact Book 2014] In fall 2014, 46.1% of Harbor students were enrolled only in DE classes; the other 53.9% enrolled in both DE and traditional classes. The college does not offer correspondence courses. Decisions for program and course development are made by administrators, division chairs, and instructors in consultation with career advisory committees or the college’s matriculation office. Evidence for this decision-making process may be seen in a number of disciplines and their course development:
   - **Math** evaluated its learning assessment results and the extended time to completion for many students. As a result, the department initiated a new math pathway sequence that now includes new Math offerings including Statistics.

   - **Anthropology** developed two new courses to fulfill the requirements for the major transfer degree (A-103 Archaeology and A-104-Linguistics).

   - **History** developed a U.S. History of Working People course-History 82 to align with the interests of CTE students and to provide CTE students with the opportunity to earn GE credits for either Social Sciences or Humanities. History also added History 58-Asian-American in the History of the U.S. and History 74- History of Asia to expand the departmental offerings and provide a well-rounded curriculum for historical study.

c. Course instructors, division chairs, and administrators evaluate their course offerings to determine those courses best suited for online delivery. In consultation with its career/technical advisors Harbor College offers three completely online degrees in business, administration of justice, and fire technology. The primary justification provided in the ACCJC-approved substantive change proposals was the increase student access.

d. All classes regardless of delivery have identified student learning outcomes (SLOs) that are defined and regularly assessed by discipline faculty who coordinate with each other and with the SLO coordinator. Assessment results from both delivery systems are also reported at the SLO webpage.
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e. Traditional and DE classes are evaluated with no distinction between the means of delivery. Once a course is offered online it is monitored for retention and completion. Student evaluations are also considered to ensure that the mode of delivery does not negatively affect either pedagogy or course content and that all classes are appropriate to the mission of the college and higher education. As a result of assessing student outcomes and retention in Math, the discipline removed 123C as a DE offering and instead offers it only in a traditional format.

f. In addition to SLOs, achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, and transfer are tracked by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The office provides data that is evaluated at the discipline, program, and institutional level in consideration of appropriate curricular and delivery decisions. For example, comparison of successful completion and retention in traditional (Fall 2013 Completion: 66.4%, Retention: 84.3%) with online classes (Fall 2013 Completion: 59.6%, Retention: 76.7%) prompted individual faculty and the Learning Resource Center to revitalize an ETUDES Help Desk and online orientation workshops to promote stronger retention and completion for online students.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. All instructional programs are congruent with the college mission and are appropriate to higher education and its goals. Harbor College has developed clear pathways for students with the creation of thirteen AA-T and AS-T degree patterns. Instructors and counselors encourage students to declare a major. Degree programs are of sufficient content and length and are conducted at the level of rigor and quality appropriate to higher education. The college defines standards for student achievement and assesses performance. Student outcomes are published and assessment results are integrated into the program review and unit planning processes.

A specified career counselor was hired in 2014 to provide dedicated pathway guidance. In compliance with the state’s Student Success and Support Program requirements, entering students must be assessed and have an educational plan before registering for classes. Data show that assessment and educational planning point students in the right direction and help achieve the college mission. Data also shows that special programs directing students toward clear transfer or career pathways such as Harbor Advantage, Puente, and CHAMPS also contribute to increased student focus and pathway completion. (ER 9 & 11)

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:
Full time, part time, and adjunct faculty are hired based on their qualifications and teaching expertise in specific disciplines. All instructors meet state and district required minimum qualifications and ensure that their course content and pedagogy maintain professional standards and expectations as determined by the discipline and college. Faculty submit course outlines of record and are regularly evaluated on these standards.

Harbor College instructors are accountable for all “academic and professional matters” defined by California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Article 2, Sections 53200 and 53201, perhaps better known as the “10 + 1” all of which are necessary for student success. Instructors are experts in their fields and continually work to bring this expertise to their students; instructional improvement results primarily from course, program, and institutional assessment and the resulting dialogue. Appropriate teaching methods are also considered as part of regular faculty evaluations.

While reviewing assessment outcomes at discipline and division meetings, faculty discuss the relationship between methods of instruction and student performance. These discussions translate into “use of results” strategies; improvements that are incorporated into a division’s program review and unit planning. Assessment of SLOs along with ongoing design and update on course outlines ensure that instructional methods and course content are current and pedagogically sound.

The Distance Education Committee meets regularly to review DE courses, new developments on the ETUDES platform, and their implications for DE course organization and instruction. DE instructors in the Social and Behavioral Sciences participate in CCC Confer conferences which provides an arena for informally evaluating online pedagogy and discussing “best practices.”

Staff development activities also contribute to instructional improvement. All first-year probationary faculty participate in a year-long orientation program that specifically addresses professional standards and expectations. The LACCD offers a yearly Faculty Teaching Learning Academy (FTLA) that encourages stronger integration of curriculum and technology. Harbor College’s Professional Development Committee also provides on-campus training which may be counted as part of the hours required for professional development each year.

Individual faculty members also participate in the professional organizations and activities of their respective disciplines to remain current in their field and to develop and sustain teaching and learning strategies. This outside participation also counts toward professional development and is documented yearly in the Flex Reports that are evaluated by the Flex Committee.

Harbor College also supports a Teaching Learning Center (TLC) to encourage all faculty and staff to remain current in the use of technology in the classroom. The center organizes workshops and online opportunities in addition to “walk-in” help for professional development.

Analysis and Evaluation:

All faculty for traditional and DE courses participate in the college’s assessment processes, review of results, and discussions leading to improvement. The college hires qualified instructors who are
encouraged and supported in their improvement efforts through the ongoing and consistent assessment process as well as a variety of arenas that the college and district provide for training, discussion, and faculty development. The College meets this Standard.

**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:**

a. Faculty and the SLO coordinator work together to identify and align learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level. This coordination applies to the college’s traditional and DE courses. All course outlines include a link to student learning outcomes for each course. This provides accurate mapping of course content and objectives to SLOs, and it allows the SLO process to respond more quickly to assessment findings more quickly than would be possible if SLOs were tied to the periodic curriculum review cycle.

b. The following chart clarifies an alignment of course, program, and institutional outcomes in preparation for a common assessment that was developed within the Social and Behavioral Science Division, the largest division in the college. Based upon a chart that tracked U.S. Women’s participation in the labor force, discipline faculty from History, Sociology, Political Science, and Psychology developed and delivered a common writing prompt that required students to explain specific trends evidence on the chart in the context of their specific discipline.

c. History students wrote of *Rosie the Riveter* and the post-WWII backlash to move women out of the workforce; Sociology students dealt with woman’s defined role in the post-war family; Political Science students examined the impact of women’s political participation; and Psychology students covered the emotional issues confronting post-war women. One common assessment allowed participating faculty to assess not only their specific course outcomes but targeted a Social and Behavioral Science Program (summary and analysis of graphic and textual information) and Harbor College Institutional (Cognition) outcome. As a result of this assessment, faculty reviewed their other course materials to better incorporate quantitative data into their classes. In History, for example, the assessment contributed to a revised class activity in which certain eras of history are reviewed with a demographic chart that students now analyze. Other instructors also incorporate much more graphic information and analysis into their classes.

### Social and Behavioral Science – Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE SLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>History 12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summer 2015 disciplines within Social and Behavioral Science organized their second integrated assessment to evaluate students’ oral communication competencies. Based upon a rubric instructors evaluate classroom presentations. The assessment will be conducted in fall 2015 with review of the assessment data scheduled for January 2016.

d. Faculty are required to list course outcomes on each course syllabus and systematically assess and review results. One hundred percent of course outcomes have been assessed as of spring 2015 and many classes have completed multiple cycles of assessment which has resulted in revising and consolidating previous outcomes.

e. Ongoing dialogue about the revision of outcomes and how to revise them based on previous results occurs at all division and department meetings, as well as over email between individual faculty members. This flexibility is made possible by the use of SLO links in course outlines. Doing so allows SLO review to happen more frequently than periodic course review. Flex credit is given to faculty members in order to acknowledge and encourage their continuing involvement in the SLO program. The further enhancement of assessment-based planning, promises to increase this dialogue and focus it around measurable outcomes.
f. In 2014, the College completed a complete cycle of assessing all five of its Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Completion of the full institutional assessment cycle then resulted in an evaluation of the process and the consolidation of two outcomes into one: Specifically, ISLO #4 (Social Responsibility in a Diverse World). [Institutional SLO Assessment]56. Combining these two institutional outcomes was prompted by a re-focusing on campus diversity, which coincided with one of the campus’ ATD interventions: Culturally Responsive Training57. This intervention provides a day-long workshop to create stronger cultural awareness among faculty, staff, and students and to encourage the integration of cultural diversity into the academic curriculum and an awareness of diversity into student services.

g. In fall 2015 the entire (course, program, and institutional) outcome reporting process was moved onto SharePoint in order to streamline and provide broader accessibility to the entire campus.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard by sustaining and refining its institutional assessment procedures. This process provides for up-to-date course outlines in accordance with Title 5 Standards (a minimum of every five years, plus two years for CTE requisites) for every course. All outcomes are published on course syllabi to reinforce the primary learning objectives for all students.

In order to further streamline the assessment process and integrate assessment into the College’s broader planning process, in fall 2015 the College piloted an integrated assessment program review process that is designed to strengthen the link between college-wide assessment, improvement strategies, and program review, and unit planning.

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:

a. Pre-college and college curriculum are designed around and determined by levels and activities consistent with similar courses offered throughout the state (both at the community college level and, in some cases, at the CSUs), standard college course objectives and prerequisites.


c. In English, for example, students are initially assessed and cutoff scores are periodically adjusted to more accurately reflect student success in classes where they are placed. The college has three levels of ESL, a number of Developmental Communication (primarily reading/literacy) courses, non-credit basic skills courses, additional workshops in grammar, usage, vocabulary building, etc. prior to transfer-level English. There are two levels (English 21 and 28) prior to the transfer-level English 101 (there are three and five-unit variants of the pre-transfer level courses). At the end of English 28 there is a
common exit essay evaluated by the department. This is similar to various writing competency essay exams giving at other community colleges and CSUs; it helps insure those moving into the transfer-level course are capable of success at that level.

d. One of the Achieving the Dream interventions for student success included the Math Department’s addition of Math115 (Elementary Algebra) and Math 125 (Intermediate Algebra)—two courses that shorten the developmental math pathway and a preparatory statistics course, Math 137 (Pre-Statistics), which non-math major (non-STEM) students can take in place of the three-course pathway to college level Statistics.

e. After reviewing the retention and completion rates of students in the basic skills classes, and finding them unsatisfactory, the Math Department offers intervention programs such as workshops and supplemental instruction to increase student success.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The pre-collegiate level curriculum is clearly distinguished from college level courses in accordance with standard college course objectives and prerequisites. The courses are designed (and in Math redesigned) to support student learning and prepare students for college level curriculum. Harbor College offers its pre-collegiate courses in traditional mode to insure that students at this level experience a classroom setting with face-to-face instruction and interaction. None of the basic or developmental education courses are approved for distance education. The only pre-collegiate course that is DE approved is Math 123C, which is one level below transfer. The class is evaluated with the standard DE addendum (in Section VIII of the outline) for validation. That form provides space to indicate DE equivalents for methods of evaluation and instruction. The College meets this standard.

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. (ER12)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. LACCD Regulation E-6459 outlines the process for the development, alteration, and discontinuance of programs. Section 2 of that document specifies that all program proposals must address appropriateness to mission, need, quality, feasibility, and compliance.

b. The same evaluative criteria applies to both traditional and distance education programs. Regardless of delivery mode, all degrees and programs demonstrate appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. Program evaluation takes each of these criteria into account.

c. As required by the Program and Course Approval Handbook, 5th edition, the Curriculum Committee considers program outcomes and goals when approving program proposals,
and compares these to each course used in a program to determine if the inclusion of a proposed course is warranted.

d. For Career Technical Education programs, the Curriculum Committee further considers labor market research and input from advisory committees consisting of representatives from relevant fields to assess the need for proposed programs and insure that programs are appropriately meeting that need.

e. The two major programs (English and Mathematics) have embedded their corresponding course sequences in schedule of classes. They are sequentially numbered in the form of easy to follow flow chart which includes pre-requisite for each course as well as course description. Ultimately, the courses at the bottom of the flow chart are all transferable course to UC/CSU systems.

f. For programs that may lead to transfer, the Curriculum Committee considers the lower-division curriculum for corresponding programs at area CSUs, UCs, and other institutions in order to insure that our programs meet the standards of those institutions. For associate’s degrees for transfer the Curriculum Committee matches the TMCs course for course and insure that each course matches the standards of the C-ID descriptors to insure transferability of courses in accordance with regulations.

g. The degree requirements for each program are listed in the college catalog and online, specifying program prerequisites, if applicable, course requirements for the completion of degrees, and program learning outcomes. This information is also published in the advisement brochures available at the Counseling kiosk in the Student Services and Administration Building (SSA).

h. The catalog further specifies policies regarding academic standards:
   - List of Associate of Arts and Science Degrees with its respective general education plans
   - List of curriculum for Certificates of Achievement
   - List of curriculum for Skills certificates
   - Graduation requirements
   - General Education Requirements for Transfer patterns sheets (CSU, UC, IGETC)
   - Requirements and general information for transfer to Independent California Colleges and Universities
   - Instructional alternatives such as Extension, Evening and Outreach, ITV (Instructional Television), CalWORKS/Gain, International Education, PACE (Plan for Accelerated College Education), and Honors Transfer.
   - Descriptions of courses

i. All course prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories are evaluated according to Title 5 requirements using a Limitations on Enrollment addendum form attached to course outlines. This insures that such limitations are warranted and that any disproportionate impact to student access to courses or programs that may have existed has been addressed in the institution’s equity plan.

Analysis and Evaluation:
The College meets this standard. The degrees and programs offered by Harbor College follow practices common to American higher education. Course outlines and programs of study are regularly reviewed for length, depth, and rigor through evaluation of Title V outlines and through assessment. The college incorporates a substantial component of general education into its degree programs to ensure breadth of knowledge and stimulate academic inquiry. (ER12)

**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. (ER 9)

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. Faculty and administrators in each Division collaborate to determine the best possible sequence of course offerings to will allow students to complete their programs in the projected time span required and to minimize the potential cancellation of courses that may be lower in enrollment due to their advanced place in a sequence of courses. (Federal Regulation)

b. Enrollment and student success data are used to evaluate current scheduling and inform future plans. Because of their need for program completion, most courses are offered every semester, daily, nightly, Saturdays or through DE according to 6-year plan to meet students’ needs. Other courses are offered on alternate semester basis due to lesser demand. All schedules are consistent with the established expectations of higher education.

c. Selected sequences or sets of courses (see Math and English) are arranged into flow charts published in the Catalog and online to help guide students and advisors in choosing the appropriate course required for a program. Assessment integrated with program review in the English department led to a rotation of courses to meet the needs of transfer students with an AA degree in English. Because a minimum of six units must be taken from section B (English 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208) the department insures that one section of each is offered at least every other semester. Since an additional six units may be taken from this same group of classes or from any other 200-level classes (or English 127-Creative Writing), the department plans that all courses will be offered at least once in every two-year period. This planning provides a maximum choice to students in the English program.

d. Curriculum mapping insures that courses are offered in sequence to enable students to progress within a period of time that is consistent with the expectations of higher education. This information is published online and in various reports as the 6-year Planned Offerings.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
The College meets this standard. The college’s principle degree programs are congruent with its mission and with the established expectations in higher education. Ongoing consultation between administrators, discipline faculty, and student services assures that the institution schedules course offerings to maximize student progress through its certificate and degree programs. (ER 9)

**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:**

a. To address the diverse needs and learning styles of students, the college provides daytime, evening, and Saturday offerings with on-campus classes in basic skills, major and general education requirements for associate’s degrees, general education transfer requirements, and lower division university major required courses.

b. The college also offers numerous distance education class sections and online learning support services. All classes offered through ETUDES provide a direct link to the library on the main webpage and DE students are also given tutoring support through NET-Tutor. All DE courses mirror the requirements and standards of traditional classroom courses. DE courses are evaluated each semester and results are reviewed by DE instructors and the use of DE instruction in general is reviewed by the DE Committee at its monthly meetings.

c. The College supports three completely online degree programs (substantive change approved by the ACCJC in 2011) in business, administration of justice, and fire technology. The college’s PACE program provides intensive accelerated classes on an alternate calendar that is designed primarily for returning adult students.

d. All DE instructors are required to train on ETUDES, the specified platform used by Harbor College. The college also offers professional training to help faculty meet accessibility standards as well as captioning for recorded online course content.

e. Traditional and DE courses are evaluated with a variety of assessment tools that include objective tests, research and writing assignments, laboratory activities, and oral presentations. Since 2012 as programs conducted their assessment processes, many professors consolidated previous student outcomes and created more authentic assessment tools that include a writing component to better teach and evaluate student communication skills.

f. The college provides numerous opportunities for professional development on the topics of diversity and equity. Two such examples are the Culturally Responsive Training and the College’s participation in the Achieving the Dream initiative as a Leader College. Data collected through both programs allows a better determination of campus disparities and lays the foundation for equity interventions.

g. The college developed numerous academic and student support programs that address diversity and equity. The programs include:
   - Alpha Gamma Sigma and Honors Transfer Program
   - Puente
   - Harbor Advantage (a first-year experience program)
   - STEM (Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics) advisement program
   - CHAMPS Program Challenging Athletes’ Minds for Personal Success
   - Music Department Student-Teacher-Academic-Rescue-Squad (STARS) Program

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
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The College meets this standard. The college’s participation in Achieving the Dream has furthered its awareness of the issues of diversity and equity and their impact on student success. Ongoing assessment enables instructors to identify student areas of weakness and strength and to organize (or reorganize) appropriate learning and assessment tools. Learning support services, particularly in Math and English, in addition to support programs that address specific needs have significantly impacted student retention and success. In Economics for example, the discipline identified the need for a review of algebra concepts before taking Economics courses. The Economics professor offered a series of two two-hour math refreshers prior to the start of the semester in 2014-15. Attendance at the fall workshop was strong and positively affected course retention. The acceptance of formal prerequisites for the course then led to the online presentation of these concepts.

**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:**

a. English and Math use department-wide tests to assess prior learning and to determine the most effective classes to offer. In the English department the test is administered in English 28 (one level below freshman composition) and measures written communication. Trained faculty, most of whom teach English 28, score the tests holistically with a rubric. The scoring rubric is similar to that used in a comparable CSU class which also limits test bias. The English Department has also prepared a similar examination for English 21 that is scored similarly to the English 28 model.

b. Data review led the Math Department to re-evaluate its placement program and change from the Compass assessment tool to the Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project, as a more realistic diagnostic measure of Harbor’s student population.

c. The Math Department also assessed its overall curriculum, which prompted the addition of Math115 (Elementary Algebra) and Math 125 (Intermediate Algebra)—two courses that shorten the developmental math pathway. The Math Department also created a preparatory statistics course, Math 137 (Pre- Statistics), which non-math major (non-STEM) students can take in place of the three-course pathway to college level Statistics. The math faculty continues to offer a pre-assessment and pre-semester boot camp experience for students, to refresh math skills prior to assessment and to enhance success in math courses in which they are enrolled.

d. All placement tests meet state matriculation laws of monitoring and addressing test bias as well as validated tests for reliability. Staff and professional development efforts to increase awareness of diversity and the potential unintentional bias continue in an ongoing effort.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College meets this standard and ensures that its measures of student learning are valid and unbiased. Appropriate processes are in place to enhance reliability and reduce bias.
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. (ER 10)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Harbor College adheres to Title 5 regulations as defined in the Program and Course Approval Handbook, 5th edition, for determining course units versus hours, i.e. the Carnegie formula. All associates degrees and certificates of achievement meet the standards set forth in Title 5 as demonstrated by the fact that they have been approved by the CCC Chancellor’s Office. (Federal Regulation)

b. All articulated courses meet the standards set forth by the institutions to which they transfer, particularly if they are articulated to meet major requirements and/or general education requirements. Specifically, the college uses the criteria outlined in Title 5 for assigning courses to areas of emphasis and/or GE areas. Career Technical Education programs are approved by the various regional consortia to meet the standards set form by industry.

c. College faculty and staff have established and assessed learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. The college views outcomes as goals set by the faculty, academic disciplines, support services, and the college as a whole to measure how effectively courses are being taught and services provided.

d. There is no distinction made between traditional and distance education courses. Both share the same learning outcomes and similar assessment tools. College-wide assessment and analysis of outcomes for traditional and DE courses provide a reliable source of data to judge student learning. This achievement data translates into course credit or the granting of degrees and certificates.

e. As part of the campus-wide effort to streamline the assessment process disciplines have mapped their course outcomes to those of a program and the institution. Mapping provides coordination and significantly promotes the effectiveness of the outcomes dialogue as one course assessment tracks from the course to the program to the institutional level. All outcomes are regularly reviewed, updated on the assessment website, and integrated with program review and unit planning.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College awards academic credit based on generally accepted practices in higher education and in accordance with statutory or system regulatory requirements. The units of credit are consistent with institutional policy and the accepted norms of higher education. Clock-to-credit hour conversions are also applied and (ER 10). The College meets this standard.

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. (ER10)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. In keeping with the College mission to provide a path to transfer, the college establishes articulation agreements with public and private institutions. The articulation process begins when discipline faculty initiates a course outline based upon its positioning in the state-provided Transfer Model Curriculum. [CCC Transfer Model Curriculum Templates] Federal Regulation

b. The College Curriculum Committee reviews the proposed course outline to insure that content and expected learning outcomes and for the proposed course are comparable to those of four-year institutions and that a “baccalaureate” level of work is being provided and corresponds to the e-regulations established by the LACCD. With approval at the college and district level, the College articulation officer the coordinates articulation agreements with four-year universities and colleges. Using the process defined by the Handbook for California Articulation, Policies and Procedures artication agreements are based on course outlines and occasionally course syllabi and communication between the articulation officer and discipline faculty in 4-year schools. (Federal Regulation)

c. To accelerate student’s overall transfer process, the College developed 13 AA-Transfer and AS-Transfer programs. Development of these programs encourage students to focus on specific areas of interest and to establish a transfer pattern and plan early in their college careers.

d. The transferability of Harbor College courses and programs is stated on the Articulation webpage, the College catalog, and the Schedule of Classes.

e. Counselors review transfer requirements with students, use the General Education Certification and IGETC guidelines and other specific university websites determined by their transfer aspirations.

f. The College Transfer Center provides workshops that are developed specifically for CSU, UC, and private university transfer. The Center sponsors weekly visits from university representatives to provide specific counseling on transfer needs. The Transfer Counselor/Director develops and presents transfer application workshops throughout the year. When deadlines for university admissions are approaching the workshops are offered two to three times a week. The Center also organizes a yearly Transfer Fair in the fall that brings representatives from the CSU, UC, and private universities to campus for interaction with potential transfers.

g. All policies for transfer are reviewed yearly to guarantee their relevance and currency. Articulation agreements with most private universities are also reviewed on a yearly basis.

Analysis and Evaluation:
Harbor College meets this standard and awards academic credit based on generally accepted practices from degree-granting institutions and in accordance with regulatory requirements. Programs are congruent with the College mission and are based on recognized articulation agreements with public and private universities that correspond to its mission. These agreements certify that the college’s learning outcomes for transfer courses are comparable to those of the learning outcomes for the four-year institutions. Transfer-of-credit policies are made available to students in the College Catalog and the college website. Policies are also published on hard copy hand-outs that are used by counselors and students when formulating an education plan. (ER10)

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:

a. Harbor College’s Institutional Learning Outcomes include:
   1. Communication: Use language and non-verbal modes of expression appropriate to the audience and purpose.
   2. Cognition: Use critical thinking skills to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate ideas and information.
   3. Information Competency: Utilize research skills necessary to achieve educational, professional, and personal objectives.
   4. Personal and Social Responsibility: Demonstrate sensitivity to and respect for others and participate actively in group decision making.

b. Under the direction of the Assessment Committee and the SLO coordinator, the College completed an entire cycle of institutional assessment, evaluating all five Institutional Learning Outcomes beginning in 2010. After completion and review of the fifth outcome, the Assessment Committee recommended that ISLO #4 and #5 be combined into Personal and Social Responsibility.

c. After completing the cycle, a campus-wide evaluation of the assessment process found that the college has embraced the course assessment process and its implementation [Institutional SLO Assessment](#).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. In response to the assessment committee’s 2014 the CPC initiated a streamlining of the assessment process. Beginning in fall 2015 the college initiated a pilot program for assessment based planning. Course, program, and general education outcomes are mapped with institutional outcomes and all assessment data is entered into the Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS). The alignment of course, program and institutional assessment results have been integrated into program review and unit planning. This model significantly improves the link between assessment, review, and planning and promises a broader campus-wide dialogue around assessment and its potential for student improvement. (ER12)
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. (ER12)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. In spring 2015, the Curriculum Committee established policies for assigning courses to general education (GE) plans. The College adopted the Title 5 standards for four of the five GE areas and the CSU GE standards for the fifth.

b. To promote student accessibility, general education courses are offered with both traditional and distance education delivery modes. Course outlines for both modes of delivery are the same and have the same assessment of outcomes. Proposals to add courses to GE will be evaluated based upon the standards set forth in the document. [Curriculum Committee Minutes: April 14, 2015]76.


d. With the leadership of the SLO coordinator and the interdisciplinary Assessment Committee, the College has also established General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) for each of its general education-related programs (four Liberal Arts and Sciences and one Liberal Studies). Each GE learning outcome has been mapped to and ISLO, thereby providing the primary data for the assessment of the GELOs. In spring 2016, the Assessment Committee will evaluate whether the standards by which the courses were placed into the GE programs are appropriate and whether or not the GELOs have been met within a specific institutional outcome.

e. Two new certificates of achievement have been developed: the CSU GE and IGETC. Once approved by the CCCO these certificates will add another general education award option that will be measured against the same standards noted above.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Harbor College meets this standard by requiring that all of its degree programs include a substantial component of general education that ensures broad knowledge and inquiry. The College Catalog articulates four Liberal Arts and Sciences degrees and one Liberal Studies. All course, program, and General Education outcomes are mapped to ISLOs. This streamlining process focuses assessment at all levels toward the institutional goals and assures that the broader goals and values of the institution are assessed. (ER12)
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:

a. All degree programs adhere to Title 5 regulations: they include a minimum of 60 units, including a minimum of 18 units in an area of focused study and one of the two general education plans (A: 30 units, or B: 18 units CSU GE or IGETC), plus various combinations of restricted and unrestricted electives. Soon Plan A and will be retired and one college General Education plan will be created that will require 21 units of general education. Degree information and requirements are published in the College Catalog and are available online and in hard copy.

b. Each degree program includes a minimum of 18 units in an area of focused study, with the exception of the anticipated soon-to-be-approved general education certificates, which include 37-41 units of interdisciplinary studies instead.

c. Upon successful completion of a degree or certificate, the student would be able to demonstrate competency in all four of the ISLOs. Each program assesses if all four ISLOs have been achieved by assessing discipline courses, major preparation courses required for that degree (Annual College Profile 2014).

Analysis and Evaluation:

Courses are aligned within a General Education pattern or an interdisciplinary major preparation in addition to the discipline requirements. AATs/ASTs are aligned with a major at the CSU system. The College meets this standard.

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. (Federal Regulation)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Faculty and advisory committees help to identify the skills required for employment which are then reflected in the specific SLOs of each course within the program. SLOs are developed to ensure that course content is relevant and of sufficient rigor to prepare students for work in highly competitive fields. Examples of these competencies follow:

Nursing develops learning outcomes based on the college mission, as well as the state board of nursing standards and program accreditation standards as well as contemporary nursing practice.
The Architecture and Design program also builds upon foundational knowledge and teaches architectural and design competencies that prepare students to successfully meet licensing qualifications and standards.

The Commercial Music program also builds upon the college and program mission, a foundational knowledge of the Fine Arts and Humanities, and continues with focused study in music performance, composition and arranging, and technology. The curriculum meets all district and state standards and is developed and periodically reviewed by faculty specialists, the college Curriculum Committee, with input from music industry experts who serve on the Commercial Music Advisory Committee.

b. Employment competencies are determined by licensure pass rates, employer satisfaction surveys, new graduate surveys, transfer rates to higher education and input from advisory boards. Because most Commercial Music majors do not go on to work in traditional fulltime employment but instead work as freelance musicians, it can be difficult to trace student success. Nursing tracks student accomplishment through its state board pass rate. Architecture has a good relationship with local employers who, based on experience with past students, return to the program for new candidates.

https://effectiveness.lahc.edu/academic_senate/cte/Committee%20Documents/LAHC%20CTE%20OS%202015.pdf

Analysis and Evaluation:

Harbor College meets this standard by ensuring that graduates who complete career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate competencies (professional and technical) that are determined by both faculty and the industries they serve. These competencies are determined by input from advisory boards, licensure pass rates, and employer satisfaction. (Federal Regulation)

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:

a. The process of program viability for significant change or elimination is outlined in the Academic Senate Planning and Policies Manual Program/Pathway Policy and Procedure Manual. The college process aligns with a similar procedure defined in LACCD Board Rule 6803.10 (pg. 3).

b. Both of these processes begin with program review based upon an analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Decisions are made by the Academic Senate and administrators prioritize student need and the importance of as little disruption as possible to student progress.

Analysis and Evaluation:
The College has in place processes for evaluating program viability and elimination, including arrangements for students who are affected by program elimination. The College meets this standard.

**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:**

a. The College sustains the quality and currency of all instructional programs an ongoing and systematic process of program review rooted in assessment at the course, program, and institutional levels. Other than the mode of delivery there is no distinction (faculty expertise, learning outcomes, course content, and assessment) between courses that are offered online and those delivered in a traditional classroom setting.

b. To continually improve on these processes, the College shifted to a SharePoint organizational system to improve access and usability. Implemented in the summer of 2015 with training workshops offered in fall of that year, the system strengthens the pre-existing tools and promises to further stimulate the use of data in all institutional improvements. The streamlined process also promises to directly align assessment with program review and unit planning.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College meets this standard. Regardless of distance education or traditional delivery methods, the College regularly evaluates all instructional programs to assure learning and achievement. The streamlining of the assessment process and the mapping of course, program, and General Education outcomes with institutional outcomes keeps the college mission in the forefront and drives program innovation and student achievement.
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. (ER 17)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Library & Learning Resource Center (LRC) Student Support

a. A new library and learning support facility opened in April 2014. The new facility provides an expanded computerized study area on the ground floor plus individual and group study areas and a library instruction classroom on the second floor. The Learning Resources Center (LRC) portion of the facility includes specific tutoring areas, the High Tech Center, and the Writing and Math labs.

b. The Library and LRC offer workshops to address specific areas of student learning. Librarians regularly consult with faculty who request instruction for their classes in specific areas of information competency. Each semester the LRC offers general academic workshops on topics such as correct citations, preventing plagiarism, and research organization. Recorded workshops also provide online library instruction. The workshops are regularly reviewed and updated by the new instructional librarian who was hired in spring 2015. (Federal Regulation)

c. Student and faculty use of the Library and LRC have expanded significantly as a result of the new Library and Learning Resource Center facility. In fall 2014, which was the first full semester in the new building, enrollments in Tutor I (section 8950) jumped 83% (542 actual enrollments) over fall 2013’s enrollment of 296 students, though AccuTrack, the computerized sign in system indicates that there was a 110% increase in activity (899 individuals logging in for fall 2014 versus 413 for fall 2013). According to the LAHC Office of Institutional Effectiveness findings, which uses a college-wide survey form (LACCD Student Survey) to capture student satisfaction with individual components/activities of the college, there is a high level of student satisfaction (88%) with Library and LRC services [see LRC Student Survey (2010-2014) and LRC Student Survey (Spring 2014)]. The LRC’s own survey, as well as separate Math, Writing, Literacy/Reading Center labs and tutoring-in-subject area surveys, reflect a similar level of student satisfaction with LRC activities [see Spring 2014 Student Survey Responses, Spring 2015 Student Survey Responses, Point of Service Survey (Oct. 2014), Point of Service Survey (May 2015)].

Quantity, Currency, Depth, Variety

d. The Harbor College Library provides adequate resources to traditional and online students as well as faculty. For traditional students, the Library meets the ACRL standard for number of
volumes based on its FTES (80,000 volumes). Throughout 2014-15, the Library used lottery monies to purchase new books based upon the guidelines of its collection development policy. Guidelines also determine the Library’s weeding (collection evaluation for removal on a section-by-section basis) process. A complete weeding of the collection was done in 2013, but the process is ongoing.

c. For online students the Library provides access to EBSCO-e-books and online data bases. Online reference services and QuestionPoint are also available. *Guide on the Side* which provides the capability for online workshop modules is currently in development. *(Federal Regulation)*

d. To ensure currency, depth, and variety of resources the Acquisitions Librarian serves on the Curriculum Committee and is thus aware of developments and trends in course approvals and developments of programs and pathways. The Acquisitions Librarian also regularly notifies the campus of all new book purchases. The Library chairperson is included in the routing of all course approvals and revisions in the ECD system. This alerts the librarians to new courses and enables librarians to make materials available in relevant subject areas.

e. The Learning Resource Center provides extensive support service hours in traditional areas of student need--math (53 hr/week), basic skills (45 hr/week), and writing (36 hr/week), in addition to the services provided in the High Tech Center (26 hr/week) for students with documented disabilities [see LRC Hours of Operation (2014)\[86], LRC Hours of Operation (2015)\[87], LRC Summary Counts (Fall 2014)\[88], LRC Summary Counts (Spring 2015)\[89]].

f. The LRC also provides scheduled tutoring for approximately seven content areas, which include accounting, anatomy, and economics, among others. Student engagement with content area tutoring increases with instructor support for the activity. For example, one of the Economics instructors has shown his support of tutoring activities by reminding students of the tutoring support offered by the Learning Resource Center and by visiting the LRC while economics tutoring is going on. As a result, 30+ students have availed themselves of Economics tutoring each semester over the past several years. *Attendance Summary (Fall 2014)*\[90], *Attendance Summary (Spring 2015)*\[91].

i. Support courses are added or put on hiatus depending on student and instructor request, student interest, tutor availability, and funding.

j. The course subjects being tutored remain relatively stable (math, basic skills, reading, and writing) from semester to semester but adjustments are made in accord with student/instructor/department chair request and budgetary constraints. For example, economics tutoring was restarted fall 2014 at the behest of one of the economics professors and student interest. Student involvement has been high, so it was continued. Students use their current textbooks in tutoring sessions with the occasional supplementary text from one of the learning labs.

k. Overall, thirty-five academic workshops/semester have been added since last accreditation cycle [see Workshop Survey Results (Fall 2014)\[92], Workshop Survey Results (Spring 2015)\[93], Workshop Schedule Results (Fall 2015)\[94]]. The topics covered in the workshops range from study tips to tips on avoiding plagiarism and from learning the mathematical order of operations to executing equations with ease. “Citations 101” is offered with individual workshops devoted to MLA, CMS (Chicago Manual of Style), and APA citations formats. Attendance in these workshops was weak at the beginning of the fall 2014 semester, but as the
semester wore on, the number of students have increased, partly due to word of mouth, partly
due to instructor engagement [see Academic Workshop Sign-Ins (Fall 2014)\textsuperscript{25}, Academic
Workshop Sign-Ins (Spring 2015)\textsuperscript{26}].

l. For some courses, students are required to complete instructor-assigned Directed Learning
Activities. Regarding overall currency of materials, the instructional assistants in Math and
Writing attend Math and English department meetings and are informed of changes in course
requirements and are provided with new texts when needed.

m. The Literacy Center/reading lab, is directed by the department chair of Developmental
Communications, who makes sure that the Literacy/reading Lab has up to date materials,
Directed Learning Activities, and updated software.

\textit{Assessment}

n. Student inquiries and student input assess the effectiveness of the library collection.
Intra-library loan requests are also an effective indicator of the need for individual titles and of
gaps in various subject areas. Intra-library loan requests are fulfilled and records of the requests
are kept with distinction made between “personal interest” requests and assignment-based
requests. These indicators become the criteria for acquisitions. Intra-library loan requests must
be fulfilled by a librarian intermediary to determine if the request is necessary due to a lack of
sufficient material in our collection.

o. The effectiveness of the types, quantity, currency, quality, and variety of support services
offered is evidenced by the results of a number of assessment vehicles, including (1) Office of
Institutional Effectiveness assessments comparing student user success data (grades, retention,
persistence) in tutored courses versus non-user success rates, (2) data culled from the overall
college survey of students, (3) a variety of LRC in-house student satisfaction surveys, point of
service surveys (when logging out of tracking system), (4) email surveys for follow up on
responses to the point of service surveys, (5) counts on AccuTrack of student activity, and (6)
instructor input regarding the library and LRC resources and their correlation to the
achievement of student learning outcomes for a specific class [see \textbf{Successful Course
Completion (10-23-2014)}\textsuperscript{27}].

p. All distance education students are welcome to use the LRC’s on campus tutoring services and
NetTutor, an online tutoring service. The ETUDES platform, which the college uses as a
framework for both on-campus and online courses, permits instructors and classmates to
respond to student questions both synchronously and asynchronously.

q. Additional LRC tutoring venues for online students utilize NetTutor’s worldwide Whiteboard
[see \textbf{LAHC NetTutor Usage}\textsuperscript{28}] and on-campus tutor time for DE students. DE students are
provided with links to instructor-selected, professionally produced support materials from
Intelecom/Online. Kurzweil is a reading software that has an online component- students can
request an account in person or via email/phone and then utilize limited components of the
Kurzweil software with just an internet connection.

\textit{Analysis and Evaluation:}
The College meets this standard and provides, through ownership or contractual agreement, long-term access to sufficient information and learning support services adequate to its mission and instructional programs. These services are adequate wherever they are offered.

The College provides library and learning support resources that promote student learning and achievement and hence the mission of the college. The LRC supports both faculty and students and provides sufficient materials in terms of quantity, quality, and depth. LRC personnel (both librarians and instructional assistants) regularly consult with instructors and respond to faculty requests for specific materials or workshops within budgetary constraints. Not all requests for tutoring in different subjects can be honored. For the most part it is recognized that reading and writing are the skills that students need to develop first before engaging in the content of each discipline. Workshops addressing students’ reading and writing needs are widely available. To address specific content areas the institution is considering the implementation of Supplemental Instruction programs. However, funding and contractual issues are major considerations in implementing this program.

Personnel are active members of a variety of college committees (Distance Education, Technology Advisory Committee, Student Support) so are constantly interacting with faculty and student support areas and remain up to date on specific needs. Electronic access to library materials and learning support services are available to both traditional and DE programs. These support programs include Net Tutor. The new LRC facility includes increased accessibility to these computer based services. (ER 17)

**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:**

**Faculty and Learning Support Expertise**

a. Faculty expertise and cooperation is essential to the success of both the Library and LRC. Library staff actively pursue a number of connections with the faculty including representation on the Curriculum Committee where input regarding learning needs is sought. Library workshops designed for specific courses also identify needed course materials and build a one-on-one relationship between faculty and librarian.

b. Librarians frequently communicate with the campus notifying all of new acquisitions as well as soliciting input for the purchase of new material. Departments regularly inform the Library as to what resources they need. The Library also supports departments with individualized workshops. For example, in Psychology’s Research Methods course faculty and librarians developed a two part orientation workshop on the research and preparation of a literature review. Creation of the workshop and the resulting dialogue between the librarians and psychology instructors resulted in identifying several additional resources materials needed to adequately complete the assignment. For an online history research project (History 11- U.S. Colonial History) the library supplemented the course materials with an additional online tutorial explaining the process of locating sources and their use. For distance education courses, the Library keeps constant watch on the development of new curriculum so that it can be ready to support when the course goes online.
c. To insure maximum utilization of the Library’s online capabilities, the Library has consistently prioritized an Information Technology-Instructional Assistant position in its unit planning. When filled, this assistant position will provide technological support for student use of online resources. [Jonathan- Library Unit Plan]

d. The LRC Director is also a member of the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate and is kept informed about student learning needs by faculty members on these committees. Faculty members not on these committees occasionally contact the LRC Director about their students’ and their needs.

e. Faculty expertise is also evidenced in terms of instructors who work at the Writing Center and also oversee the learning labs at the LRC. Tutors at the LRC must be recommended by faculty in order to tutor and the chairs of Math and English directly supervise the instructional assistants in those areas.

**Student Learning and Support for the College Mission**

f. Library and LRC Program Outcomes are closely aligned to the college mission and its assessment through the Institutional Learning Outcomes. In 2013-14 the Library took the lead in a college-wide assessment of Institutional Outcome #3- Information Competency that offered a pre and post-test.

g. Assessment of Library workshops is conducted each fall semester. Library workshops are followed by a short web-based quiz, which serves as a method to assess the library’s achievement of identified learning outcomes. Jonathan

h. A deeper analysis of the Library’s role in supporting research assignments is taking place in English, Psychology, and History. Changes in the quality and variety of citations are tracked prior to and subsequent to students’ attending the library workshop. Preliminary results from this pilot study were completed in fall 2014 and are currently being assessed.

i. Informal quizzes and oral questions and answers are used to measure the relative impact of the 35 forty-minute workshops that the LRC offers on relevant topics. Various measures are taken to identify the value added to student learning by the LRC, including comparisons of tutored cohorts versus non-tutored student cohorts studying the same subject. Data demonstrates that LRC tutoring activities is directly related to student success in the classes for which they receive tutoring.

j. A dialogue is underway regarding gathering data to measure the quality and extent of library use as students prepare to transition out of the college. The discussion so far has suggested the use of exit surveys and recruiting campus clubs or honors program students to collect data (jl).

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College meets this standard. Faculty, including librarians and instructional assistants, regularly consult regarding the availability and sufficiency of equipment and learning materials for both traditional and distance education classes. Both types of classes assess identical SLOs so it is possible for librarians, instructional assistants, and faculty to examine and compare the results. While
identifying the impact that library services have on students’ success remains a challenge, several attempts have been made to capture this effect.

In History for example, both a traditional and an online class were assigned a research essay that required Chicago Style citations and included a library source orientation. When compared to earlier assignments, the work of both classes improved largely because of the support of librarians and a citations workshop provided by a learning specialist. Psychology 41 used a pre/post design that showed that the students’ work quality improved significantly after attending a Library workshop. This workshop exposed students to a variety of databases and the APA style. Roughly 80% of students improved their assignments by one full letter grade after attending the library workshop specifically designed for psychology students.

The new LRC facility has seen a dramatic increase in student use of the computers in the library which has clarified the need for an Information Technology-Instructional Assistant to provide stronger technical support for students. The Help desk at the LRC and LRC staff are trained on ETUDES and can help students troubleshoot problems and answer students’ questions. While the college does not provide specific equipment for DE classes, individual faculty and the LRC provide workshops and hands-on training for DE students. ETUDES also provides an online tutorial that is available to all online 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:**

a. Analysis of fall assessments is shared among librarians, with findings highlighted for discussion. Assessment results and dialogue resulted in the finding that the scope of workshops needed to be limited. Broadly structured workshops evidenced less student learning and retention while subject-specific workshops with specific tasks and outcomes were more successful. The subject specific workshops were also more likely to create stronger bonds between the Library staff who were familiar with specific assignments and student need. Students who participated in subject specific workshops were more likely to return to Library for further work or resources.

b. Student success (persistence and pass rate) related to Learning Resource Center tutoring activities is directly related to student success in the classes for which they are receiving tutoring. Various measures are taken to identify the value added to student learning by the LRC, including comparisons of tutored cohorts versus non-tutored student cohorts studying the same subject. Recommendations for improvement are based on identified outcome shortfalls.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
The College meets this standard with the use of evaluation in both the Learning Resource Center and the Library. The LRC evaluates its offerings with data from its regular fall assessments as well as input from faculty and staff. The assessment result from pre-and post-tests have led to offering more workshops focusing on specific topics, building stronger relationships with library staff, acquisition of resources. Currently the college is examining faculty input and student use of Net-Tutor in order to evaluate its usage and benefit.

It has been observed that math needs among students lead to an increase in the number of math tutors. However, many students use the math tutoring services only once. Designing a survey to address these issues will help the LRC better understand who is being served by the tutoring services. The LRC is working on a process to track the service usage and success rates of math and English students. Another strategy proposed by LRC is to train tutors in basic study skills to address this deficiency among students.

**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. *(ER17)*

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. The Library and LRC contract with a variety of library and student support services. These include the Library contract with OCLC to provide 24/7 reference service through QuestionPoint and the LRC’s contract with Link Systems International, Inc., for NetTutor, an online tutoring service which tracks students’ monthly use of the service and Engineerica Systems Inc. for AccuSQL, also known as AccuTrack, a computerized tracking system to log student contact hours in the LRC and in lab classes throughout the campus. *(OCLC QuestionPoint Purchase Order; EBSCO Print Subscriptions; Community College Library Consortium Contract) (ER17)*

b. The LRC contracts with Ware Group for Reading Plus, Cambium Learning Inc., for Kurzweil, a specialized software system needed for students with learning disabilities (with vision or hearing impairment or for students who have a difficult time reading).

c. GoPrint to enable pay-to-print and pay-to-copy. The Library and LRC faculty and staff monitor the quality of the service, and the contract itself is managed by the Business Office. *(GoPrint Purchase Order)*

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College meets this standard and provides, through ownership or contractual agreement, long-term access to sufficient information and learning support services adequate to its mission and instructional programs. The Library catalog is a LACCD purchase and is shared with other district libraries. This facilitates intra-library loan and delivery. District librarians meet regularly to share resources and support services challenges and ideas.
Overall funding for the Library and LRC has improved significantly with Program 100 funding in place. However, several challenges to the optimal functioning of the library still remain. For example, “thin client” computers do not read USB flash drives, or they are so slow that they do not serve the interests of students; due to structural limitations many work requests remain unfulfilled. Similarly, technology help requests are uncompleted or unfulfilled. This challenge is expected to change soon with the hiring of a dedicated Instructional Technology technician for the library. (ER17)
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. (ER15)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Student Services is incorporated into the Harbor Assessment -based Planning System (HAPS) that places evaluation and assessment as the center of program review and unit planning. Three Student Services units participated in the college-wide pilot program in fall 2015. By utilizing this system, the evaluative process will be streamlined for Student Services and enable all units to make decisions based upon the goals set by the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP).

b. Incorporation of student services into HAPS has been preceded by service units’ ongoing evaluations that are an integral part of sustaining support service quality.
   - The Child Development Center (CDC) is involved with the Child Development Department and serves as a lab school and practicum placement for students who are training to become pre-school teachers. They also serve as a learning environment for the Nursing Program. The CDC links their SAOs with the outcomes for both of the instructional programs involved with the center. [Child Development Unit Plan]
   - SSSP services conducted analyses for 2014 to assess their progress in meeting the state mandates of assessment, orientation, and providing education plans for all new students. The number of students taking the assessment tests increased by 15% based in part to a change in hours of operation. [SSSP 2015-2016 Unit Plan].
   - CalWORKs workshops are regularly evaluated through the use of surveys at the end of workshops. Surveys were conducted during fall 2014 (Fall 2014 CalWorks Workshop Evaluation) and spring 2015 (Spring 2015 CalWorks Workshop Evaluation) asking students to rate the quality of the workshops provided and to include at least one student learning outcome. The surveys also asked for future workshop topic recommendations. Based on the results of these surveys, changes were made to improve the workshops based on students’ evaluations. By fall 2015, the program received ratings of 100% satisfaction (CalWorks fall 2015 Workshop Evaluation Results).
   - The Career/Transfer Center regularly evaluates the quality of its services through evaluations that are provided both online and on paper surveys.

Analysis and Evaluation:

All support programs regularly evaluate the quality of their efforts and insure that, regardless of location or means of delivery, the support services are accomplishing the college mission. The College
meets this standard by providing appropriate student support services that foster student learning and
development and fulfill the college mission. (ER15)

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. (ER15)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Student Service programs at Los Angeles Harbor College have established Service Area
Outcomes (SAOs) that are assessed, reviewed, and updated according to relevant data Student
Services SAOs. The incorporation of Student Services into the HAPS system and the direct
link between SAOs and the SEMP measurements will further improve unit SAOs, program
review, and planning.

b. SAOs for student services units are reviewed and posted on the college website (Cluster and
are evidenced in the unit and cluster plans. SAOs are now alignment with the SEMP and
accessible on SharePoint.

c. Ongoing review of outcomes for the Athletics Program when correlated with Achieving the
Dream data resulted in the establishment of the CHAMPS program in 2013. CHAMPS is
gear toward raising the academic performance of student Athletes’ many of whom also fit
within the college’s disadvantaged and underperforming cohort. The program includes a part-
time athletic counselor who insures that Athletes’ establish an educational plan, attend classes
full time, participate in learning communities, and take part in learning support activities such
as tutoring. Athletes’ must submit weekly reports that are reviewed and monitored by the
Athletic Office. Over the course of the program, these support activities lead to higher student
success rates than the general population. [Spring 2015 CHAMPS Progression Report]

d. A first-year experience program called Harbor Advantage was initiated for fall 2014 with an
initial cohort of 250 students. These students were enrolled in a block schedule of English,
math and counseling classes as well as one class in their career pathway or major. The students
had to be full-time students for fall and spring of their freshman year. Overall, Harbor
Advantage students had a higher (86.4%) fall-to-spring persistence rate compared to the first-
year student population (71.9%). Tracking the success of this program has led to its growth and
expansion. Fall 2014 Harbor Advantage Progression Report

e. The majority of students at Harbor College place at the basic skills level and are low income.
One area that addresses the needs of our students is the Financial Aid Office. Changes were
made in the processing of students’ financial aid awards to better serve economically
disadvantaged students. Now students are packaged more efficiently allowing them to register
in a timely manner and have resources to obtain books and supplies needed for their classes.
Financial Aid Unit Plan 2015 - 2016

Analysis and Evaluation:
The College meets this standard. Data, such as that included in the Equity Plan, is used to determine student needs and to develop programs to meet those needs. The programs undergo continuous evaluation for improvement.

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. (ER 15)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Harbor College offers both traditional and distance education courses each semester. Student Services provides equitable access to students who are using either delivery method. These services include face-to-face and online access to Admissions and Records, Counseling, Financial Aid, DSPS (Special Programs and Services Website). Ensuring that the college provide access for all students is another indicator of quality and of serving its mission.

b. Life Skills Center provides access through a comprehensive website which describes all the services and how to contact faculty and staff who work in the center. DE students as well as students attending the physical campus may review the website, download materials from it, request other materials be sent to them, and/or call the center for support.

c. Traditional and DE students have equal access to financial aid services. The office maintains consistent policies, trainings, first level of review, supervisory review, website information and the accessibility of email and online services to all students. (Financial Aid Department Website; Higher One Card website)

d. Access to services of the Counseling Division are provided via a comprehensive website which includes materials such as counseling forms, upcoming events and workshops, deadlines, and links to additional resources (Counseling Division Website). Counseling faculty respond to student inquiries via email for students who are participating only through DE courses. The Information Desk, which is housed in the Counseling Division, is staffed Monday through Thursday from 8:00am – 7:00pm, and 8-4pm on Fridays with staff and student workers who are available by telephone to answer students’ general questions, and to refer students to counselors.

e. The EOPS and CALWORKS programs are also available to both DE and traditional students via websites that are regularly updated with the most accurate information (EOPS Department Website). Offices are staffed at all times during office hours to provide face-to-face information and answer phone inquiries. Full time staff members may be contacted via email. The CalWORKs Facebook page is updated regularly with additional information for students (CalWORKs Department Webpage).

f. Under the DPSS civil right guidelines, all CalWORKs participants may request services in his/her designated primary language. The CalWORKs Office has the tools and resources to provide such services. All staff is also required to complete a civil rights training through the
County of Los Angeles. Staff and faculty are regular attendees of cultural trainings and workshops to practice and develop a better understanding of diversity.

g. Equitable access to reliable child care is also available at the Child Development Center (Child Development Center Webpage). Eligibility requirements are posted in the application and in the parent handbook. Parents are required to submit supporting documentation at the time of enrollment. Every student application is based on income, family size and parent need. Parent fees are based on a sliding scale developed by the Department of Education and parent reported income.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard by providing appropriate student support services that foster student learning and development and fulfill the college mission. (ER15)

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:

a. The equity work group within the Student Success Coordinating Committee regularly reviews the demographics of the college population to address the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience. (Annual College Profile 2014, Student Success Umbrella Committee Minutes)

b. The College regularly sponsors Culturally Responsive Training workshops for students, staff, faculty and administration. Through explanation and activities, the four hour workshops educate the college on issues of race, ethnicity, and social capital.

c. Through a collaborative process, faculty, staff, students, and administrators decide, prioritize and determine which student events and activities will best meet student’s needs or student support. In 2013-14, the College sponsored a Financial Literacy program to address students’ limited financial knowledge. The Life Skills Center also provides various workshops examining primarily the psychological impact of society and culture on the lives of students.

d. The Association of Students regularly sponsors or co-sponsors events/activities to highlight the college’s social and cultural diversity. Constitution Day, Black History Month, Women’s History Month, Club Rush, All Souls Day-Day of the Dead celebrations are designed to broaden the cultural experience of all students. Event decision making can be based on past attendance, participation, cost/finances or desire of students to organize and promote the event/activity.

e. Campus clubs also promote the college mission and broaden the social and cultural experience of students. Counselors and discipline faculty serve as club advisors for organizations such as
the Honors Club, the Latina Leadership Network, the Black Student Union, the Equity Club, EOPS Club. Clubs are also organized around possible career options for students including the Administration of Justice Club and the Neuroscience Club.

f. Athletics is an extension of the college’s total educational program that is conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity (Athletics Webpage). Athletic programs (coaches) recruit student Athletes’ from different types of communities, ethnic and social back grounds, gender, life style, and students who are at risk. The athletic programs include male and female participants from across the community’s ethnic, racial, and social spectrum. Athletics instruction includes teaching teamwork, courage, and discipline in order to fulfill the college mission and enhance the educational and social experience of student Athletes’.

g. The financial integrity of the Athletic Program is sustained through close monitoring of specific programs and their cost.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard as it provides a variety of co-curricular activities and programs that enhance student awareness of social and cultural issues.

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:

a. Harbor College supports student development and success through a variety of counseling and academic advising programs. The Counseling Division consists of general counselors and counselors designated to specific student populations, such as nursing, Puente, and student Athletes’, EOPS, and CalWORKS.

b. Evaluation
   o Full time counselors are evaluated by a committee of counselors and administrators. Evaluation is based on work performance and student evaluations of the counselor. Recommendations are made to counselors to improve performance, if needed.
   o Trainings for adjunct counselors and counseling assistance are offered on campus. Counseling faculty members are also asked to attend seminars, trainings, and conferences to obtain the most up to date information. Some of these trainings are offered online via webinars or telephone conferences. Specifically, CalWORKs staff and counseling faculty members attend annual CalWORKs conference, and district wide program trainings.

c. Counseling/ Academic Advisement Programs
   o The Harbor College homepage offers links to the academic programs and student services. The website was redesigned in 2015 to improve student access and usability. The College Catalog and Schedule of Classes are posted online as well.
o Harbor Online offers including “Chat with a Counselor,” “Frequently Asked Questions,” and “Schedule a Counseling Appointment,” for advising DE students.

o Academic programs also have webpages with specific information for students interested in that field of study. For example, Nursing provides “Get the Facts” to clarify the class sequencing required for individuals interested in pursuing a Nursing career (Nursing Department Information Webpage).

o For students interested in transfer, articulation agreements between Harbor College and universities may be accessed through the Articulation webpage which also links to Assist.org, the official repository of articulation for California’s public colleges and universities. Counseling also provides color-coded program sheets that clarify the curricular options and specific requirements of all programs.

o Counselors conduct in-person New Student Orientations using a locally-developed power point presentation to orient students and to clarify the requirements for specific programs. Counseling and other campus support services are referred to in the power point to inform students about requirements as well as the support structures for student success. Online students may currently take advantage of the online “Prezi” orientation and questionnaire/quiz. The LACCD is contracting with a vendor to provide an online Orientation, which may be in place by fall 2015.

o In order to fulfill the state-mandated SSSP requirements the Harbor Advantage Program now requires that all entering first year students formulate an educational plan in consultation with a counselor.

o To further promote understanding of educational requirements, counselors offer workshops throughout the year, make classroom visits, coordinate College & University Transfer and Career Fairs providing representatives to meet with students. Counseling also notifies students regarding graduation and application deadlines, university representative visits, probation status, using the SARS e-blast or SARS call features.

Advisement Personnel

d. Harbor College hires qualified counselors to perform the advising function. Regular Counseling Division meetings are held throughout the school year, providing in-service training, communication, and opportunities for the campus community to meet with Counseling Faculty regarding updates to programs and on topics of concern. Counselors share conference attendance reports regularly in meetings, and via email.

e. Counseling and advisement is a core service offered by the EOPS/CARE program. In addition to meeting the general requirements for counselors, EOPS counselors are required to have experience and/or training in serving disadvantaged populations. EOPS counselors provide career planning services and teach Personal Development classes designed to provide students with educational skills and knowledge to become better students. In addition, EOPS counselors receive regular training at the local and state level.

f. Adjunct Counselors receive one-on-one training initially, followed by group training, in order to be well-trained to serve students. Counseling Assistant (CGCA) training is held at the
beginning of the school year, and as needed. Counseling Interns are mentored by a full time counselor for one semester. Their internship follows the Counseling Intern Orientation Workbook, developed by one of the counselors and a Psychology adjunct professor. Mentors come to the Counseling Division from several university counseling programs such as CSUDH, CSULB, and Loyola Marymount University.

g. Student Workers deal directly with students and the general public at the college’s Information Desk/Counseling area. Student Worker training is offered prior to employment by the Counseling Division and College Work-Study Program. In depth student worker training is offered on an on-going basis by the Counseling Secretary.

h. Financial aid also reviews educational plans for assistance and financial aid eligibility. Financial aid staff is trained to assist all students in debt/default management, budgeting, overall knowledge of financial aid programs, and the process for state and federal funding. College scholarship information may be obtained on the website, or through the financial aid office or via phone or specific email inquiries.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard and provides counseling and advisement programs that support student achievement and success.

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. (ER-16)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. The College has adopted and strictly follows admissions policies consistent with its mission as a public community college. The policies comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 5. The admissions policies are published in the College catalog and in the Registration Guide on the Schedule of Classes webpage.121

b. Qualifications for a program are identified within the AAT and AST degrees listed in the college catalog along with Skills Awards and Certificates of Achievement. Graduation patterns/plans (Plans A & B, IGETC, and CSU General Education Certification) are listed on the college website, in the College Catalog, and on color-coded advisement sheets. Academic programs each have their own webpages that provide further information about programs. (Schedule of Classes webpage).

c. Incoming students use computers at the Career & Transfer Center to complete their Harbor College application. Transfer Center staff regularly refer new students to appropriate offices to complete their matriculation process, apply for financial aid, and to determine their educational goal.

d. Admission policies for EOPS program are based on state educational code. Admission to CalWORKs services is determined by Los Angeles County’s identification of current
CalWORKs recipients, have a current CalWORKs WTW plan, be either a county referred, self-initiated participant, or be a county exempt participant, and be enrolled in a credit or non-credit course.

e. Evaluating the impact of counseling and advisement programs falls within the college’s assessment-based planning system. Each campus program evaluates its program based on the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) that includes key measures such as completion and transfer. Based on these measures, programs develop unit plans that may detail improvement strategies if needed.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Harbor College adopted and follows admission policies that are consistent with its mission and specify the qualifications for program admissions. The College meets this standard. (ER-16)

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:

a. The matriculation process is designed to support a seamless transition from high school to college and assist students in achieving their educational objectives. Los Angeles Harbor College implemented an integrated online admissions, registration and records system (CCCApply) that is integrated with the campus portal pipeline.

b. The effectiveness of Admissions practices and tools are evaluated by the Admission & Records district wide Committee (minutes), as well as being coordinated with Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), Student Equity and Student Success Coordinating Committee (SSCC) where all campus student success initiatives and interventions are vetted through robust dialog and later approved through consultation, District student satisfaction survey, and Categorical Program Review.

c. The evaluation of placement processes are used to ensure their consistency and effectiveness of English, Math and ESL placement instruments and practices is validated according to state guidelines (Title 5 – 55510(a)(4); 55520(c); 55521(a)(b)(c)(e); 55522; 55532 (a)(c)(d). Students who need accommodation for a disability are tested in the DSPS office or in the LAHC Assessment Center. Special consideration for specific groups of testers includes giving directions for ESL tests in Spanish with individual assistance available for languages other than Spanish by request.

d. Harbor College uses placement instruments MDTP for math and are transitioning to Accuplacer for ESL and English. All tests are approved by California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCO) based on validation studies conducted by the publishers and the College. English, Math and ESL placement practices have been validated and approved by CCC Chancellor’s Office. The validations include bias studies. The validations are updated every six years.
e. One requirement for approval of the placement process is a consequential validity study that measures student and faculty satisfaction with the placement process. LAHC’s placement process has easily exceeded the state requirements. The program has full state approval until July 2016. Documentation of the validations resides in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

f. All instruments have been submitted to cultural and linguistic bias studies and have subsequently been approved by the Chancellor’s Office. In addition, disproportionate impact studies are completed regularly to monitor placement rates by gender, ethnicity, and age. This latter cycle should be evaluated every three years.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Los Angeles Harbor College meets this standard by regularly evaluating admissions and placement tools to validate their effectiveness and limit bias. In spring 2014, math faculty conducted content review of curricula with regard to the ACT Compass, which led to questions whether the instrument was accurately placing students. Rather than attempt a current validation of ACT Compass cut scores, math faculty requested a return to the Mathematics Diagnostic Placement Test (MDTP) paper and pencil instruments.

In fall 2014, the College collected data for validation of cut scores for math assessment using the MDTP. The data analysis was summarized in a report published in January 2015 that addressed the State guideline requirements for math assessment instruments used to place students into appropriate levels of mathematics. (Evidence: Matriculation Report 2015 – Math Assessment and Outcomes Study)

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:

a. The College maintains student records in accordance with District Board Policy and Board Regulation 7707 which conform to Title 5 as well as to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA). Both address accessing student records and help the College to ensure that student records are adequately protected, maintained, and discarded.

b. Pursuant to Title 5, sections 54606-546008 and 59020-59029, records are classified as permanent (Class 1), optional (Class 2), or disposable (Class 3). The LACCD Board created a Classification of Admission and Records Documents. Class 1 documents are stored permanently in the database after they have been scanned, and original paper records are reclassified as Class 3. The College retains Class 2 records indefinitely unless reclassified as Class 3. Class 3 records are stored for three years in the College warehouse and then are destroyed. Paper records that have not yet been scanned are stored in locked containers in College offices accessible only by staff.

c. The College’s Enrollment Services Office has developed the Student Records and Retention Policy, a document that includes District Board Policy and Regulations, the government code, the California Education Code, and the administrative code, Title 5 of the State of California.
d. In keeping with District wide procedures, College staff members authorized to access student information are individually identified and are required to login during each access to view or perform transactions. To attain access to the Student Information System (SIS) staff member must receive authorization. This authorization is only granted after the request has been reviewed and approved by the Department Supervisor, the appropriate Vice President, college Information Technology Director and finally the Dean of Admission and Records.

e. The College assigns various levels of access to personnel based on their respective scope of responsibilities. In particular, temporary and student employees are strictly prevented from having privileged access to change their records or those of their classmates. The District SIS has a reporting system which allows for the tracking of transactions on student records by user identification.

f. The College maintains assessment results in a secure database with access limited by individual login. All areas providing counseling services track student appointments in the Student Appointment Record System (SARS) database, which is generated by the SARS-GRID program, a student appointment scheduling package from SARS Software Products, Inc. The SARS database has limited access that requires user login to computers connected to its server. The Financial Aid Office adheres to Federal and State law and regulations and follows FERPA and the Buckley amendment with regard to the student record policy.

g. The College regularly and automatically backs up its servers, with backups stored on a secure off-site server. The College also archives data daily using College and District servers. The District’s transaction logs permit restoration of all computer data with the loss of no more than one day of data even in the event of catastrophic failure.

h. The College scans paper records into the Papervision document storage system, which is held on a secure server on campus and at the District Office. Additionally, backup servers are both on campus and off campus, and the College limits access to records by individual login. The College maintains records established prior to 1984 on microfiche stored in a secure area in the Enrollment Services Office and accessed as needed.

i. District policy allows students to inspect or to order their records/transcripts, to petition to amend their records, or to allow someone else to access their records/transcripts. Students can access their records, including their unofficial transcripts, online via Student Portal (DEC), the District’s online enrollment system. In 20XX, the District outsourced online official transcript ordering through National Student Clearinghouse, a company providing online ordering through a secure network.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard and 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. The College has established policies in place that limit access to student records. To provide further protection against identity theft, the practice of using social security numbers for student identification has been limited.
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).
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:

Integrity and Quality

a. Los Angeles Harbor College assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing well-qualified administrators, faculty, and staff. The Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC), the Human Resources Committee (HR) and the College Planning Council (CPC) are integral parts of the college procedures and planning processes.

b. FHPC is composed of faculty representatives from each division plus administrators who prioritize division requests resulting from their program review and planning process. Hiring requests are organized on a rubric that requires a justification for the position based upon FTES, WSCH, and FTEF and its alignment with the college mission (FHPC Request for Position Form). In an all-day session FHPC reviews all requests and hears oral explanations for the positions. After reviewing the written and oral justifications, FHPC then organizes a priority list of hiring.

c. The Human Resources Committee follows a similar process for classified hiring. Both HR and FHPC evaluate position requests in light of the college mission and send recommendations onto CPC and the president for approval. (FHPC Committee Documents)

d. The college follows very specific district policies for the hiring of all senior academic and administrative positions at the college. LACCD Human Resources Guide HR R-110

e. Once the filling of a position is approved by the president, the specific hiring criteria is defined by the dean, division chair, and discipline faculty. If one of these criteria includes DE, required training and some experience with distance learning will be noted in the job descriptor. (CCC Minimum Qualifications PDF Document; LACCD Examples of Minimum Qualifications; Academic Minimum Qualifications)

f. In order to select the best qualified candidate for employment at Los Angeles Harbor College, hiring criteria, position qualifications, and procedures for selection are made clear and publicly stated to all seeking positions at the college. Both applicants to the College and the College’s hiring committees are informed of every step of the hiring process. Example of Job Posting with Minimum Qualifications
g. Faculty and staff serve on all hiring committees to insure integrity and quality. If DE is one of the hiring criteria at least one of the members of the hiring committee will have experience with online pedagogy. LACCD Hiring Policy

h. Full-time and adjunct faculty members are selected by strict adherence to the Los Angeles Community College District’s minimum qualification standards that are grounded in State of California Educational Code. The minimum hiring guidelines assures that candidates invited to interview for positions at Los Angeles Harbor College possess the appropriate education, training, and professional experience to provide quality support and expertise to the programs in which they will serve. Questions regarding equivalency of degrees with non-U.S. institutions are referred to the District for review. New Employees Forms and Information

i. Los Angeles Harbor College works closely with the District's Personnel Commission throughout each step of the candidate screening and hiring process to assure that the hiring procedures are consistently applied and that all candidates will be best suited to serve the needs of the institution and its student population.

j. Los Angeles Harbor College employs the District’s Human Resources policies and procedures for administrator, faculty, and staff recruitment. These procedures require that vacant positions and their related job descriptions are analyzed to ensure that they are relevant to the needs of the department and that they support the college's mission and goals before they are announced. Job descriptions are vetted by both the College and the District before the position is publicly announced and the hiring process begins.

LACCD Recruitment, Selection and Employment

Analysis and Evaluation:

Los Angeles Harbor College meets this standard and assures program integrity and quality with a systematic process for hiring qualified administrators, faculty, and staff. Decisions to hire are decided within the college’s designated planning processes. For faculty hires the FHPC submits a prioritized list for approval to the Academic Senate and the Human Resources Committee recommends staff hiring for prioritization to CPC. Approved recommendations are then forwarded to the president. Training and skills required for each position are publicized and qualifications are appropriately verified either by the Personnel Commission or the Hiring Committee Chair. The college meets this standard and ensures a fair and equitable process that sustains program integrity through quality hiring.

- CCC Minimum Qualifications PDF Document
- LACCD Examples of Minimum Qualifications
- Academic Minimum Qualifications
- Example of Job Posting with Minimum Qualifications
- LACCD Hiring Policy
- New Employees Forms and Information
- Documents Needed
- LACCD Employment Opportunities
- LACCD “Classified” Employment Opportunities
- New Employees Forms and Information
- Seven Step New Employee Hiring Process
- LACCD Recruitment, Selection and Employment
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. (ER14)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Los Angeles Harbor College hires only faculty who are well skilled and knowledgeable in the subject matter for which they are being employed. A strict criterion for selection of faculty includes documented scholarly activities, documented knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed, demonstrated effective teaching skills and pedagogy, and demonstrated potential to contribute to the mission of the College. All faculty job descriptions include curriculum development and review and experience with learning assessment. (Faculty Selection – Tenure Track; Employment Opportunities for Academic Positions; Employment Opportunities with LACCD; Examples of Academic Job Postings)

b. Throughout the faculty screening and interview process a candidates qualifications are thoroughly screened and confirmed through a review of the candidates degrees earned, the candidates transcripts, appropriate levels of professional experience and assignments, assessments of curriculum developed and taught, and documents related to participation in campus and scholarly activities. (LACCD Selection Policies)

c. For faculty hired to teach in fields with DE offerings the interview includes several questions regarding DE training, experience, and expertise. Although ETUDES training and an online pedagogy course is required for all instructors at Harbor College, candidates who have worked with other online platforms will be considered provided that their pedagogy reflects technological expertise and academic rigor. (Academic Minimum Qualifications)

d. All hired Los Angeles Harbor College faculty possess the required subject matter expertise and skills needed for performing effectively in their discipline. (Subjects, QTOP’s and Minimum Qualifications sorted by QTOP ; Faculty and Administration Level of Education)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Faculty qualifications are closely examined throughout the initial vetting and hiring process. This examination includes degrees, experience with traditional and online teaching (if desired), academic expertise and scholarship, and a candidate’s potential to contribute to the college mission. The College mission requires that instructors address basic skills as well as transfer level courses in both traditional and online settings in order to take students to successful completion. Faculty fulfill this challenge and demonstrate that their qualifications and experience have prepared them for the task. The 2014 Student Survey demonstrates the expertise of faculty. In response to the statement “I receive excellent
instruction in most of my courses,” 87% of students either agreed or strongly agreed. The College meets this standard.

- Faculty Selection – Tenure Track
- Employment Opportunities for Academic Positions
- Employment Opportunities with LACCD
- Examples of Academic Job Postings
- Example of Job Posting and Required Documents
- New Employees Forms and Information
- LACCD Selection Policies
- Faculty Selection – Tenure Track
- Academic Minimum Qualifications
- Subjects, QTOP’s and Minimum Qualifications sorted by QTOP
- Faculty and Administration Level of Education

**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:**

a. Los Angeles Harbor College employs well-qualified administrators and other college staff who are responsible for the operation of educational programs and services. All administrators meet or exceed the minimum degree and skills qualifications established by the State Chancellor’s Office, and credentials are vetted prior to hiring. Of the full-time staff, approximately 20% hold doctoral degrees; 57% hold master’s degrees; 10% hold bachelor’s degrees; and 1% hold associates degrees. Of the academic administrators, 25% have doctoral degrees and 75% have master’s degrees. [LACCD Academic Administrator Selection](#); [LACCD Listing of Job Classifications](#); [CCC Minimum Qualifications PDF Document](#)

b. Full-time staff and administrators at Los Angeles Harbor College possess many years of practical skills enabling them to perform successfully in their jobs and to help sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Approximately 6% percent have 30 or more years of community college service; 14 % have between 20 and 29 years of service; 36 % have between 10 and 19 years of service; and 44 % have less than ten years of service at a community college. [Fall 2011 Full-time Staff Years of Experience](#); [LAHC Seniority Lists](#)

c. Administrators and other employees regularly participate in employee skills development activities so that services and academic quality are regularly enhanced to assure that the college meets and sustains its institutional goals. For example in January 2015 all administrators participated in a leadership training retreat. The LACCD also requires administrators to participate in periodic leadership training and workshops provide training on issues such as Title IX and sexual harassment. [LACCD Training](#)

d. All employees are offered training in various training for district procedures and policies on a routine basis. During 2014-2015 multiple classes were held for district procurement training and 2015-2016 training is scheduled for new district budget and planning activities.
Analysis and Evaluation:

Administrators and those responsible for educational programs and services meet the required qualifications. They demonstrate leadership that is geared toward institutional improvement and effectiveness. The College meets this standard.

- Fall 2011 Faculty and Administration Level of Education
- LACCD Academic Administrator Selection
- LACCD Listing of Job Classifications
- CCC Minimum Qualifications PDF Document
- Subjects, QTOP’s and Minimum Qualifications sorted by QTOP
- Fall 2011 Full-time Staff Years of Experience
- LAHC Seniority Lists
- Professional Development / FLEX Committee
- Link to “LACCD Professional Development”
- LACCD Training

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:

a. Los Angeles Harbor College requires that degrees held by faculty, administrators, and other college personnel are from institutions accredited by a recognized U.S. accrediting agency. During the pre-employment application phase, all applicants for college employment must submit copies of transcripts specifying degrees held if required for the position. Transcripts are evaluated by all members of a hiring committee for appropriateness during the pre-employment applicant screening process and are required in order for a candidate to be invited to interview. The Personnel Commission screens classified applicants.

b. For programs requiring distance instruction, applicants are requested to provide evidence on their application of distance education course development and instruction or training in online pedagogy. This criteria was developed by the campus-wide DE Committee to insure the hiring of qualified DE faculty.

c. The LACCD District Office of Human Resources also reviews faculty, administrator, and other personnel pre-employment documents, including transcripts and degrees held, for appropriateness prior clearance for employment.

d. For positions that require a degree, applicants who possess degrees from non-U.S. institutions are instructed to have their transcripts evaluated by an approved foreign transcript evaluation service for equivalency. The LACCD and Los Angeles Harbor College will only accept foreign transcripts if equivalency has been established. Foreign Transcript Evaluation
Analysis and Evaluation:

The College and the LACCD verify the qualifications of all newly hired personnel to assure that they hold the necessary degrees and experience level. This process yields a highly qualified faculty and staff that hold the required degrees and are able to communicate their expertise and knowledge to students. This process enables the College to meet this standard.

- Sample Administrative Applicant Evaluation Rubric
- Foreign Transcript Evaluation

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:

a. To ensure the effectiveness of the institution’s human resources, Los Angeles Harbor College evaluates all personnel systematically and at regular intervals. Personnel evaluation procedures are governed by LACCD board policies and procedures and by policies and procedures of negotiated contracts with the collective bargaining units. LACCD Faculty Guild Agreement (Article 19 – Evaluation)

b. The Academic Affairs offices maintains a timeline to ensure that faculty evaluations are completed in a systematic and timely manner.

c. Per the contract requirements, tenured faculty are evaluated every three years alternating between a basic and a comprehensive evaluation. Probationary faculty are evaluated annually for four consecutive years prior to the granting of tenure. For probationary faculty the yearly review (within the 4-year probationary period) and evaluation is concluded by a year-end meeting of the tenure committee. Adjunct faculty are evaluated every two years. Performance Evaluation for Probationary and Permanent Classified Employees

d. Each employee collective bargaining unit has established written criteria to be used for evaluations which include an evaluation timeline and methods for evaluations. Evaluations are in place for classified employees, tenured faculty, probationary (tenure-track) faculty, administrators, and adjunct faculty.

e. Classified evaluations are conducted on a yearly basis by the department supervisor during the employees’ birth month. The dean of academic affairs maintains a timeline to ensure that faculty evaluations are completed in a systematic and timely manner. Performance Evaluation for Probationary and Permanent Classified Employees
f. Division chairs conduct adjunct and tenured faculty evaluations for both traditional and distance education classes. ETUDES, Harbor College’s online platform, provides technical access to facilitate the DE evaluation process.

g. The evaluation process that Los Angeles Harbor College employs seeks to evaluate individual employee performance so that the effectiveness of college personnel can be assessed and if necessary establish methods for performance improvement. LACCD Employer/Employee Relations Handbook “Performance Evaluation and Progressive Discipline”; LACCD Forms (Administrative Forms)

Analysis and Evaluation:

Evaluations of faculty and staff occur on a regular schedule in order to assure the effectiveness of all human resources. Like the College’s ongoing assessment and program review processes, the focus of evaluation is for improvement leading to student success. Evaluation and review leads to discussion which leads to improvement. All committee members engage in a dialogue which may result in a variety of pedagogical changes or more technology training through the college TLC or the District-wide FT LA training. Similarly staff evaluations and the discussion that follows may lead to more training or skill development. The established evaluation process also spawns a more informal but substantive discussion that continues far beyond the formal process. Overall the systematic evaluation process works and contributes to better teaching and provision of services for students. The College meets this standard.

- LACCD Faculty Guild Agreement (Article 19 – Evaluation)
- Performance Evaluation for Probationary and Permanent Classified Employees
- LACCD Forms (Administrative Forms)
- Administrative Evaluation Form for Classroom Faculty
- Performance Evaluation for Permanent Employees
- Performance Evaluation for Confidential Employees
- LACCD Employer/Employee Relations Handbook “Performance Evaluation and Progressive Discipline”
- Performance Evaluation for Probationary and Permanent Classified Employees
- LACCD Forms (Administrative Forms)

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:

- To improve teaching and learning, Los Angeles Harbor College considers how faculty, academic administrators, and other staff use the results of assessments of learning outcomes through the evaluation of faculty and staff. LAHC Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Resources

  a. On an annual basis academic divisions at Los Angeles Harbor College are required to complete Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessments and consider SLO assessments results as an indicator of teaching and learning performance. After assessment results have
been compiled, discipline faculty review the data to propose curricular or instructional changes for improvement.

b. Because many distance education faculty teach from off campus, departments use CCCConfer for faculty dialogue. In Social and Behavioral Sciences, for example, the division chair organizes at least one conference call each semester to facilitate discussion on issues related specifically to DE courses. Dialogue has resulted in expansion of the DE program in addition to establishing a more comprehensive orientation for online students. The use of new online capabilities and their relevance for education is also frequently discussed. As a result of discussions many instructors provide increased audio and video portions of their classes and have developed stronger supplementary teaching tools.

- SLO creation, assessment, and revision are a defined part of the faculty evaluation process. Through the analysis of SLO's, supervisor evaluations, peer observations, and student evaluations, opportunities to improve teaching and learning through the use of faculty and staff evaluation is a process that is conducted in an ongoing manner as employees are evaluated. The link between SLOs and employee evaluations are used to enhance curriculum and teaching methodologies to ensure that teaching and learning is improved for the benefit of students. Basic and Comprehensive Evaluation Summary Form for all Faculty; Administrative Evaluation Form for Classroom Faculty

Analysis and Evaluation:

The College meets this standard by having completed at least three cycles of assessment, review, and analysis. At the same time, it identifies communication around learning outcomes as an area for improvement. Sustaining Harbor College’s ongoing process of learning outcomes assessment is part of the evaluation of faculty, administrators, and staff who are responsible for student learning and participants in the assessment process are increasingly understanding its importance for student achievement.

- LAHC Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Resources
- LACCD Forms (Administrative Forms)
- Basic and Comprehensive Evaluation Summary Form for all Faculty
- Administrative Evaluation Form for Classroom Faculty

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. (ER 14)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Los Angeles Harbor College maintains a sufficient amount of qualified full-time and part-time faculty to ensure that the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities and quality of its educational programs and the institutions mission is sustained. New full time faculty are required to participate in monthly orientation meetings that meet throughout the first year and clarify the responsibilities required to sustain and improve educational programs and services for the
mission of the college. LACCD “Reports/Recommendations/Actions” (Enrollment Update)

a. The Vice President of Academic Affairs along with academic deans, division chairs, and program directors, regularly assesses the needs of educational programs and services to assure that the primary goals of the institutional mission are met. Monitoring of student enrollment occurs regularly and class size increases or decreases according to the number of part-time and adjunct faculty required to deliver course sections.

b. Enrollment management to monitor class and student enrollment occurs regularly. Class size increases or decreases are regularly reviewed to determine the number of full or part-time and adjunct faculty required to deliver approved course offerings and sections.

c. The number of full-time faculty at Los Angeles Harbor College is determined by the state mandated Faculty Obligation Number (FON) and the Los Angeles Community College District. To meet FON requirements and ensure educational program and service integrity, the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee annually reviews division hiring requests that are justified by a division’s outcomes assessment and program review.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Harbor College has worked to maintain the state-prescribed 75/25 FON ratio. In 2013, the college hired 1 administrator, 5 faculty, and 12 classified positions; in 2014, 2 administrators, 10 faculty, and 13 classified were hired; and in 2015, 3 administrators, 6 faculty, and 6 classified were recommended for hiring. Due to continued fiscal constraints, all of the recommended hiring has not been completed. Funding for the majority of the newly added administrative resulted from the college’s robust grant programs which require administrative oversight. The influx of full-time academic and classified personnel has reinvigorated disciplines and programs. **(ER 14)**

- LACCD “Reports/Recommendations/Actions” (Enrollment Update)
- LAHC Self Evaluation Report, 2012 (Standard 3A)

**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:**

a. As an institution which employs part time and adjunct faculty, Los Angeles Harbor College has employment policies and practices that provide orientation, oversight, evaluation and professional development opportunities to all part time and adjunct faculty. A general orientation has been developed by the Los Angeles Community College District on the LACCD website. **(Welcome New Faculty Interactive Orientation)**

b. A newly revised *Faculty Handbook (2014)* summarizes many essential topics such as course preparation, professional rights, responsibilities, and ethics, and college resources. The *Handbook* provides easy access to frequently asked questions.
c. The *Adjunct Survival Guide* is produced by the Guild's Adjunct Faculty Issues Committee (AFIC) and Guild staff, and has been updated for fall 2015. The *Guide* is a good summary resource for adjunct faculty, and it references various contract articles that apply to adjunct assignments, obligations, and benefits. Division chairs provide part time and adjunct faculty an electronic copy of the *Guide* and makes available hard copies in the respective division offices. ([Adjunct Survival Guide fall 2015](Adjunct%20Survival%20Guide%20fall%202015))

d. Adjunct faculty are provided an orientation presentation in the beginning of each fall semester during Professional Development days ([Welcome Back Reception flyer](Welcome%20Back%20Reception%20flyer)). The respective division chairs also provide a basic college orientation upon assignment to the college. ([Tips for New Teachers](Tips%20for%20New%20Teachers)).

e. The college provides all part time and adjunct faculty the opportunity to integrate into campus life through participation in Professional Development “Flex” activities which take place annually before the start of the fall semester ([FLEX August 2015](FLEX%20August%202015)). All part time and adjunct faculty have the opportunity to participate as a presenter or as an attendee in any of the professional development activities that take place throughout the academic year ([Request to Present 2015](Request%20to%20Present%202015)). Moreover, the part time and adjunct faculty are invited to participate in shared governance activities, and they are also elected by their division members to serve on campus wide committees to further integrate these faculty into the life of the institution ([Senate Committee Reps, Fall 2015](Senate%20Committee%20Reps,%20Fall%202015)). See also [AFT Faculty Guild 1521 contract](AFT%20Faculty%20Guild%201521%20contract%2C%20Article%2017.B.3.59), Article 17.B.3.59

f. Professional oversight is provided to part time and adjunct faculty by division chairs and academic deans. Division chairs supervise part time and adjunct faculty to guide and mentor them to create consistency with division policies and curriculum as noted in the chair duties ([AFT Faculty Guild 1521 contract](AFT%20Faculty%20Guild%201521%20contract%2C%20Article%2017.D.1.63)). Division chairs also assist the faculty with the development of their courses which include development of syllabi, assessment of learning outcomes, and procedures related to the successful delivery of courses ([Professional Development Syllabus Checklist](Professional%20Development%20Syllabus%20Checklist)). The deans ensure that the part time and adjunct faculty follow the administrative processes required by the college and the district as it relates to course management activities such as performing census and submitting grades ([Grade Submission Reminder, spring 2015](Grade%20Submission%20Reminder,%20spring%202015)).

g. Evaluation of part time and adjunct faculty is provided by division chairs so as to aid with the faculty members’ overall instructional improvement for professional success ([Evaluation of an Instructor](Evaluation%20of%20an%20Instructor)). Also, see [AFT Faculty Guild 1521 contract](AFT%20Faculty%20Guild%201521%20contract%2C%20Article%2019.E.1-2.69-70), Article 19. E.1-2.69-70

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

Harbor College fosters a supportive relationship between its full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty. Administrators and division chairs provide orientation, oversight, and evaluation. Adjunct faculty are encouraged to participate in college-wide professional development and to participate in developing the collegial climate of Harbor College. The college unreservedly acknowledges the skills and knowledge that adjunct faculty bring to the life of the campus both in and out of the classroom.
Standard III.A.9
The institution has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution. (ER 8)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Los Angeles Harbor College maintains a sufficient number of staff to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution. Altogether the college employs an unduplicated headcount of 480 faculty and staff. The full-time equivalent (FTE) of faculty and staff employed by the college totals 346.7. [Faculty and Staff Headcount; Faculty and Staff Headcount Distribution]

- In addition, Los Angeles Harbor College employs a sufficient number of faculty and staff with appropriate qualifications to maintain quality educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the college. The educational levels of the full-time academic staff include 20% who hold doctoral degrees and 57% who hold Master’s degrees. The educational levels of the academic administrators include 25% who have doctoral degrees and 75% who have master’s degrees. [Fall 2011 Faculty and Administration Level of Education]

Analysis and Evaluation:

For an institution the size of Harbor College current staffing levels are appropriately distributed throughout the different professional categories to sufficiently support the efficient and effective operations of the college. However, in order to serve the needs of students effectively and to comply with state education code, the college seeks to increase both faculty and staffing levels whenever required by minimum FTE and if budgeting allows. (ER 8)

- [Faculty and Staff Headcount]
- [Faculty and Staff Headcount Distribution]
- [Fall 2011 Faculty and Administration Level of Education]

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. (ER 8)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Los Angeles Harbor College and the LACCD’s hiring practices require that administrative positions employ personnel who meet minimum educational qualification of at least a Masters degree along with professional experience and expertise relevant to the administrator’s tasks and duties. [Example of Job Description (Administration)]

b. Currently 30% of all Los Angeles Harbor College administrators possess doctoral degrees in educational leadership and all other administrators possess Masters degrees. Furthermore,
full-time staff employed by the college have appropriate amounts of educational professional experience acquired both prior to being hired by the college and have accumulated experience while working at the college. 36% of full-time academic staff possess between 10 and 19 years of service, 14% have between 20 and 29 years of service, and 6% of academic staff have 30 or more years of educational service. 

Fall 2011 Full-time Staff Years of Experience; Fall 2011 Faculty and Administration Level of Education

Analysis and Evaluation:

Harbor College currently has three Vice-Presidents (Academic Affairs, Student Services, Administrative Services), six Deans (two deans- Academic Affairs, one Dean of Economic Development, one Dean of Student Services, one Dean of Enrollment Management and Evening Operations, one Dean of Institutional Effectiveness) and four associate or assistant deans funded through grants (one Associate Dean of EOPS, two Associate Deans of Grants Management and Resource Development and one Assistant Dean of YouthSource Center). Three of the administrators work within the college’s grants program that require administrative oversight for funding.

In the past two years the college has experienced significant administrative transitions. A new CEO, one vice-president (Administrative Services), two Interim Vice-Presidents (Academic Affairs, Student Services) the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, an Interim Dean of Academic Affairs, and an Associate Dean of EOP&S have assumed positions since fall 2014. All new administrators are highly qualified and experienced in community college administration and have provided continuity and effective administrative leadership. (ER 8)

- Example of Job Description (Administration)
- Example of Job Description (Faculty)
- Administration
- Fall 2011 Full-time Staff Years of Experience
- Fall 2011 Faculty and Administration Level of Education

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:

- Los Angeles Harbor College adheres to the established Los Angeles Community College District’s written personnel policies and procedures. All personnel policies and procedures are published on the Los Angeles Community College District’s website and are available for review by all personnel and the general public. Furthermore, the college and the district office provides employees with various personnel guides, collective bargaining agreements, tip sheets, and frequently asked questions related to common personnel policies and procedures. Human Resources (HR) Guides; Human Resources, Payroll, & Personnel

a. To ensure that policies and procedures are fair and equitable and consistently administered, the college and the district employ staff who monitor and enforce equal employment opportunity
to make certain that positive action is taken to ensure that non-discrimination policy is followed in all personnel practices, including recruitment, hiring, placement, upgrading, transfer, demotion, and pay practices. Furthermore, each bargaining unit has a campus representative who serves as a resource to ensure that personnel policies and procedures and union contracts are administered equitably and consistently. **District Contracts**

b. The Personnel Commission of the district has a campus on-site communication enhancement program where Personnel Commission staff visit each campus on a regular basis to listen to employees and provide counsel and information to enhance the employment environment. (Commission minutes Sept/Oct 2015)

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College meets this standard with written personnel policies that are available for information and review on the LACCD website. In addition to published materials, the various campus bargaining units hold informational meetings that are open to all members for the purpose of clarifying specific policies and procedures.

- **Human Resources (HR) Guides**
- **Human Resources, Payroll, & Personnel**
- **District Contracts**
- **Union Contracts**

**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:**

- Harbor College creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support a diverse college personnel. Guided by the LACCD’s policies and procedures on diversity, equity, and inclusion the college seeks to hire and retain a diverse personnel. **Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**

- Because of the colleges hiring practices, Los Angeles Harbor College maintains faculty and staff which are diverse in a variety of different categories including gender, age, and ethnicity. Los Angeles Harbor College employs a full-time staff which consists of 47% female and 53% male gender equity. The gender demographics for full-time faculty include 55% female and 45% male. **Full-time Staff Demographics**

- The college possesses an ethnically balanced full-time staff consisting of 24% Hispanic, 20% white, 15% African American, 14% Asian, and 19% other. Full-time faculty ethnicity diversity includes 17% Hispanic, 13% Asian, 12% African American, 13% other and 45% white. **Full-time Faculty Demographics**
Los Angeles Harbor College assesses its record in employment equity and diversity and its consistency with its mission using various indicators. A classified staff diversity survey assesses staff demographics, job satisfaction, satisfaction with college policies, the perception of college policies relating to diversity, the perception of the college's commitment to equity and diversity, and other topics. “Classified” Staff Diversity Survey Fall 2013 Results

Furthermore, the college maintains a program to develop and support a culturally diverse environment for both students, faculty, and staff. The college’s Culturally Responsive Training is designed to provide training to faculty and staff on culture and race sensitivity in the classroom and office setting. The trainings consist of workshops designed to address equity and diversity topics and challenge faculty and staff’s own perceptions and assumptions on these topics. The workshop emphasizes race, culture, and social capital in order to begin the dialogue needed to effectively bring about change, tolerance, and acceptance at Los Angeles Harbor College. Culturally Responsive Training Team; Culturally Responsive Training Results

Analysis and Evaluation:

Los Angeles Harbor College meets this standard and actively supports diversity and equity. The faculty is quite diverse as noted above and the college’s Culturally Responsive Training (CRT) has impacted campus awareness of those factors that define equity. By bringing equity topics to the forefront of the campus conversation, CRT workshops have created a more open and honest dialogue around diversity.

- Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
- Full-time Staff Demographics
- Full-time Faculty Demographics
- “Classified” Staff Diversity Survey Fall 2013 Results
- Culturally Responsive Training Team
- Culturally Responsive Training Results

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:

a. The institution holds a code of professional ethics prescribed by the American Association of American Professors. The code and its implications are explained in the 2014 Faculty Handbook (p. 28)\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^4\).

b. Professional ethics are discussed in the orientation sessions that are organized for probationary faculty every year. The sessions provide new faculty with practical ways of addressing issues of academic freedom and professionalism.

c. Within the context of its mission the LACCD Board Rules establish an ethics code that covers personnel other than faculty. (LACCD Board Rule, Ch1 Article II)\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^5\)

Analysis and Evaluation:
The College meets this standard by ascribing to a nationally recognized code of professional ethics and actively instructing new employees about professionalism in all matters. The LACCD Mission Statement and Core Values also demonstrate an ethical commitment.

**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:**

- The Staff Development and Flex committees organize professional development activities that support the college mission and provide opportunity to keep faculty and staff current in their teaching, service, and use of technology. Activities also provide updates on ongoing programs to encourage faculty participation. The Teaching Learning Center also provides weekly workshops on classroom technologies. Faculty are also encouraged to participate in the Faculty Teaching Learning Academy (FTLA) a yearly workshop that is sponsored by the LACCD. [Staff Development Committee; Teaching and Learning Center](#)

- Workshop participants evaluate each session with a standardized evaluation form that is submitted to the Staff Development and Flex Committees for evaluation. Review of faculty and staff evaluations are weighed in terms of future activities and plans for improvements in professional development activities. [Professional Development / Flex Committee](#)

  a. Flex credit is also given for professional activities offered outside of the college. Faculty and staff may apply for partial funding from the Staff Development Committee, take advantage of this credit, and attend professional conferences and training.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College plans and provides personnel with a variety of development activities and trainings to sustain professional relevance. On-campus activities are well attended and provide ongoing opportunity for faculty and staff to engage and evaluate improvement.

- [Staff Development Committee](#)
- [Professional Development / Flex Committee](#)
- [Teaching and Learning Center](#)

**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:

a. The College insures that all personnel records are secure and confidential. All files are in a locked filing cabinet and any document that contains personal information is shredded. At any time employees may make an appointment with the Human Relations supervisor to view their files. Records for certificated and unclassified employees are also kept in a locked cabinet as well.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Harbor College is in full compliance with the legal requirements for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Employees have access to all records in accordance with the law.
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:

a. To assure the safety and sufficiency of its physical resources all college facilities are constructed and maintained to the legal standards and codes as required by the LACCD, the State Chancellor’s Office, and the education code. Beginning facility needs are derived from a formula (square footage based on allotted FTE and reported FTE versus non-academic activities) from the State Chancellor’s Office.

b. Harbor College anticipates, plans, and evaluates the safety of its facilities, sufficiency of its classrooms, lecture labs, laboratories, and other facilities by maintaining current internal planning options at a department level as noted in its Facilities Master Plan (2015-2016).

c. Harbor College operates under a shared governance model and one of the most active committees on campus is the Bond Steering Committee (CORE). CORE provides discussion, planning, oversight and review of all bond building activities and college facility planning issues.

d. College Facilities and Maintenance Operations (FMO) is responsible for overseeing safety and sufficiency requirements prescribed by the District Office and ensures that all safety codes are enforced. Contract or compliance issues related to facility maintenance and ADA access are inspected by LACCD-employed inspectors.

e. Facilities are subject to regular annual review and possible on-site visits from state and district oversight personnel. Oversight findings are reviewed, aligned with the budgetary implications, and resolved.

f. College facilities support the overall needs of its educational program and instruction. The integrity and quality of programs provided through DE are assured through a contractual agreement with ETUDES which is Harbor College’s DE platform. Facilities provided for traditional and DE instructors are defined by Article 9 of the AFT Faculty Guild/ LACCD contract. The campus provides both full-time and adjunct instructors with appropriate laboratory, classroom, and office space. DE instructors are given access to an office, computer station, telephone, and areas for student conferences if needed.

g. The Work Environment Committee (WEC), a subcommittee of the CPC, is composed of administration, faculty, classified, certificated staff, and students. The subcommittee meets monthly and reviews the health and safety of all facilities; this includes offices, classroom (air, temperature, and lighting) conditions, and parking. Facility complaints are handled by the FMO or WEC. The Administrative Services Cluster also reviews pertinent facility and safety issues.
h. Under the direction of WEC and with coordination from Plant Facilities and Maintenance personnel the campus emergency preparedness and evacuation plans were updated to account for recent construction. The evacuation plans were implemented in practice drills organized in spring 2015. Emergency training, including the use of second floor evacuation chairs, was provided in Flex activities. (Emergency Response Guide). Continuous safety training and emergency preparedness activities take place throughout the calendar year.

i. The college is policed by the LA County Sheriff’s Department and crime statistics are published annually pursuant to the Clery Act (III.B…). The report is maintained by the LA County Sheriff’s Department in accordance with the Cleary Act and published on the college website.

j. 95% of off-campus events are held at local, state, and federal locations that are already held to safety and security standards. Prior to any off-campus event the administrator in charge of the area visits the site to ensure that access, safety, and security meet all state and federal standards. The remaining five percent are generally held at local facilities such as the YMCA, YWCA, or the Boys and Girls Club. All locations comply with state ADA regulations. All contracts properly provide for insurance indemnification.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Harbor College’s FMO works with the LACCD and campus representatives through WEC to assure safe and sufficient resources at all locations for its course, programs, and learning support services. The fall 2014 LACCD Student Survey clarifies that Harbor College students hold positive perceptions of campus safety. In response to questions regarding campus safety and facility maintenance, over 85% of students either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “I feel safe and secure on this campus;” 85% also noted that the “the campus is free of safety hazards;” 81% agreed that the parking lots are safe, well lighted, and well maintained; 87% agreed that “buildings and signage are clearly marked and easy to read.”

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:

a. The college has built new buildings and significantly modernized and expanded its facilities within the past fifteen years as a result of voter approval of three major bond measures that allowed all LACCD campuses and district to undertake and complete major construction projects (Proposition A in 2001, Proposition AA in 2003, and Measure J in 2008).

b. Planning for new construction provided by monies from Bond propositions A/AA/ and J was conducted in user groups and the Bond Steering Committee (CORE) meetings (CORE Meeting Minutes). A CORE representative regularly reports on to CPC (CPC Meeting Minutes).

c. CORE was revitalized in fall 2014 and a new project manager was hired to direct the final stages of bond spending. The new manager reviewed all construction contracts to date and determined final costs of completion. CORE has been tasked to decide and make
recommendation to CPC which final projects will go forward. (CORE Meeting Minutes\textsuperscript{136}). CORE is tri-chaired with representatives from the project management organization, faculty and facilities personnel.

d. Within the last three years the campus has completed and opened three of these buildings (Library and Learning Resource Center, Technology, and the Life Science Building). Other projects completed are listed on evidence sheet (College Building Program Overview\textsuperscript{137}).

e. Ongoing campus facility planning and development is coordinated between the Strategic Educational Master Plan, the 5-Year Capital Construction Plan, the Space Inventory Plan, and the 5-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan.

f. The LACCD Facilities Planning and Development Office maintain a database of facilities on all nine campuses and their relative condition to determine a replacement timeline. The FMO Director develops the annual Scheduled Maintenance Five-Year Plan of campus maintenance needs. ADA compliance, key issuance, ADA transition plans and Environmental Impact Reports are also provided. The College’s Annual space inventory determines space allocations.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Achieving the College mission within budget parameters is at the forefront of all planning, construction, maintenance and replacement of the college’s physical resources. Coordination of space allocation and maintenance particularly in light of the ongoing construction is an ongoing challenge to FMO and to all representative bodies (CORE, CPC, WEC).

Physical resource issues are openly discussed and debated in order to promote a “learner centered educational environment.” (Strategic Educational Master Plan, 2014-2017\textsuperscript{138}). In 2015, for example, the college confronted the fiscal limitations of completing the final stages of its bond construction projects. CORE and CPC were presented with two funding scenarios that entailed a decision between building a new student center or upgrading an older administration building. After discussion and input from all constituencies, the College moved forward on a new student center that is currently under construction. The technology center that was to be a part of the older buildings upgrade was then moved to multiple locations on campus. This example demonstrates the ongoing challenges that the college confronts but also clarifies the collegial process for resolving these issues.

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:

a. The Facilities Master Plan\textsuperscript{139}, one of the College Functional Plans, summarizes all construction and maintenance developments based on budget allocation. A summary of the 2015-16 Plan was presented to the Academic Senate and CPC in fall 2014 to assure that both shared governance bodies were current on physical resource issues.
b. In 2015 all functional plans, including the Facilities Plan, were further integrated into the planning process through their incorporation into the SEMP where they may then be considered in unit and cluster planning. The implications of DE offerings have very limited impact on facilities planning.

c. The Vice President of Administrative Services and the FMO director conducts ongoing evaluation of physical resources by personally inspecting the campus and soliciting input from WEC and the crafts. Contract or compliance issues including ADA access are evaluated by the LACCD. To further facilitate this process, a district-initiated computerized work order system was brought online to insure more effective and efficient use of resources and labor.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Student responses to the LACCD Student Survey positively affirm the effective use of physical resources. 86% of students either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “campus buildings are clean and well maintained;” and 88% agreed that “grounds and public areas on campus are clean and well maintained.

The integration of the college Facilities Plan into the SEMP has clarified the college’s ongoing efforts to fully coordinate facility resource planning with college-wide planning specifically support for a preventative and predictive maintenance program and to identity appropriate facility staffing needs within a broader alignment with the college mission.

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:

a. The LACCD Office of Information Technology maintains the administrative systems as well as the District wide network, web page, and web-based services for students, faculty and staff. The LACCD also provides the Student Information System as well as the Human Resource and financial systems. The District also establishes master contracts that allow all campuses within the District to purchase software and equipment services less expensively than if purchased by individual campuses.

b. General policies relating to technology services and support are set by the LACCD Chancellor and the Board of Trustees in Board Rules B27 and B28. The Technology Planning and Policy Council (TPPC)¹¹⁴ composed of administrative, academic, and technology representatives from across the District sets district-wide policy and makes budget recommendations to the Chancellor. The District Technology Council (DTC) composed of IT managers from each campus, the Chief Information Officer, and District and campus network support specialists establish district-wide standards and make recommendations to the TPPC. (District Governance and Functions Handbook, pg. 26¹⁴²). There are two representatives on the TPPC from each of the colleges in the district.

c. On-campus computer systems are autonomous with no direct District oversight and the College IT department provides and maintains all classroom technology resources and the administrative systems as well. The overall appropriateness and adequacy of technology services are identified as part of the IT program review and its subsequent unit planning. Technology needs are identified in the functional Technology Plan¹⁴³ which is presented to CPC as part of the yearly planning cycle. Technology decisions related to bond-funded projects are decided in the Bond Steering Committee (CORE)¹⁴⁴. 

d. Immediate technology needs for academic programs and support services are identified through Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) an outline work requests, IT staff meetings, calls, and emails. Technology needs are also identified in Academic cluster and Student Services meetings. In order to enhance communication and efficiency of technology planning needs, the co-chair of the Grants committee is a reporting member of the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC). Representatives of TAC from Student Services and the faculty are responsible for reporting information back to their respective areas. Effectiveness of such services are evaluated with feedback from faculty and staff and reflected within the Technology Plan and the Administrative Services Cluster Plan.

e. The campus-wide Technology Advisory Committee (TAC)¹⁴⁵ meets on a monthly basis to review technology issues and make recommendations to the CPC.
f. Harbor College’s contracts with ETUDES as its platform provider for its Distance Education program. The ETUDES contract provides a reliable, private and secure platform for the college DE program. The Distance Education Committee\textsuperscript{146} meets monthly to review the online program. The District Distance Education Committee (DDEC) meets monthly to weigh in on district wide technology needs and remake recommendations to the District Academic Senate (DAS).

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

In the 2014 LACCD Student Survey, 75\% of students either agree or strongly agree that “Sufficient labs are available to meet my needs.” Harbor College’s technology services, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the operational, academic, and support services of the college. Immediate needs and the majority of long term technology needs are being met with long term resource needs being prioritized in the shared governance process. Unexpected short-term needs can experience a delay in hardware and software support due to normal competition for limited campus resources.

The growth of technology use combined with the spread of technology into many campus functions has contributed to some delays and gaps in support. To address some of the support issues IT designated a “Power User” faculty member who is provided with an additional level of security clearance in order to perform basic updates on computer software programs and avoid classroom delays. Each “User” is assigned to a specific building which provides an on-site colleague who can address minor technology issues.

**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:**

a. The Technology Plan\textsuperscript{147} written by TAC is one of the college functional plans that is included in the planning process. At the beginning of the planning cycle college IT reviews District planning, then aligns and updates its campus IT operational plan, presents it to the Administrative Cluster plan and eventually to the CPC for review and approval. The campus IT manager writes the IT operational plan which goes into the IT unit plans and eventually the Administrative Cluster plan. Infrastructure and technology review is a main priority of TAC while operational planning and personnel review are integral parts of the Administrative Cluster review.

b. Harbor College IT conducts a yearly operations review to plan for a technology infrastructure that meets or surpasses required standards. District-wide campuses work together to review the overall compatibility of computer systems and to ensure that the computers have the appropriate software, hardware, and warranties (3 years). Some of the standards are determined by the LACCD District Technology Committee and on-campus standards are periodically reviewed (yearly). (IT Operational Plan, 2014-15\textsuperscript{148})

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
In the 2014 LACCD Student Survey, 77% of students either agree or strongly agree that “Equipment and labs are adequate and up-to-date.” Campus IT maintains and assures a reliable and secure technical infrastructure for classroom and student support services. Prioritization of operational technology needs are primarily decided within the IT Department with input and approval from the Administrative Services Cluster and CPC. The college must continue to insure that technology needs and planning are incorporated into its academic and student service planning and related cluster plans.

Technology decisions for DE classes are made by the DE Committee that represents the interests of both faculty and student services in the college communication to ETUDES. (Distance Education Committee, Agendas & Minutes)

**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:**

a. Harbor College IT assures the proper operation and maintenance of technology resources through regular review and back-ups on all systems that are conducted on a nightly basis to assure reliability and support disaster recovery if required. Some critical systems have redundant servers at a secondary site on campus. Server failover and redundancy for critical systems are partially implemented and full implementation is an on-going effort consistent with an ever changing IT infrastructure on campus. Redundancy for power of central campus IT systems is planned and implementation is in process.

b. The distance learning platform is contracted through a third party (ETUDES). Issues of reliability, privacy, security, and disaster recovery for all DL offerings are part of the contracted agreement with ETUDES. The Distance Education Committee oversees the overall online program.

c. Building a centralized IT facility has been the subject of many discussions as the college bond spending program enters its final phase, in terms of where and how to create a base of operations for the IT group. Appropriately designed space will enhance the management and operational functions.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The college maintains access, safety and security in its technological infrastructure. The 2014 LACCD Student Survey, reports 74% of students either agree or strongly agree that “The College’s Wi-Fi is accessible and secure.”

**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:**
a. Harbor College’s Teaching Learning Center (TLC) surveys technology needs through specific faculty requests and provides regular training. The TLC also regularly updates faculty on the availability of online training workshops and as well as focused training for use of specialized software. Flex activities also address the integrating technology into classroom teaching. An evaluation is completed at the end of each activity in terms of the value of the instruction and its relevance to program and institutional operation.

b. Technology instruction and support for student support staff are provided through district in-service trainings. Other vendor online training is available for some software.

c. TAC functions as a communication bridge between IT and the academic and student services. TAC representatives bring faculty and student service technology issues to the monthly meetings where they are clarified and addressed. For example, in response to faculty concerns with being unable to update computer software on their own without having to wait for IT assistance, IT trained and provided limited access to a small cohort of “power users” who can address small scale updates in their assigned areas.

d. For DE courses, the college requires that every online instructor take one online pedagogy course in addition to the instructor training provided by ETUDES. Online classes are assigned only to instructors who have completed this instruction. Online instructors are encouraged to update their courses by accessing online training as well as by attending the yearly ETUDES conference. A DE Help Desk and DE tutorials (e.g. “How-to Videos”) are available on the college website to assist students with ETUDES. (Harbor Online).

e. In fall 2015 Harbor College moved its documentation, program review and planning processes onto SharePoint in order to make data more accessible and relevant in these processes. As part of the installation campus IT ensured the SharePoint system can be used securely by faculty and staff both on and off campus. After IT installed the SharePoint program, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness provided initial instruction and support by conducting numerous SharePoint training sessions with numerous Senate and CPC committees. The Institutional Effectiveness Office provides ongoing training and support for the program.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Faculty, student and operational staff utilize a variety of professional development opportunities that are provided online, through the LACCD, and the college. Students however are not as connected to the college system. In the 2014 LACCD Student Survey, 48% either agree or strongly agree that “I do not know who to contact if I have a problem with my LACCD email account,” and 59% disagree or strongly disagree. The overall usability of the college website was significantly improved with a redesign of the college website that occurred in summer and fall of 2015. Student use of the LACCD e-mail system remains an issue that hinders communication and student success, which is being addressed by the ESC.

**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:**
a. All new hires at Harbor College are required to demonstrate some level of technological competency and skill in addition to their expertise in a content field. The Faculty Handbook provides general steps to accessing technology in the classroom.

b. The use of technology in teaching and learning is strongly encouraged by Division Chairs and discipline faculty who direct their specific areas. Instructors for traditional classes are instructed in the use of the classroom media consoles and projection systems. At professional development trainings and the TLC the use of social media is discussed along with appropriate protocols. (Faculty Handbook, pg. 16151)

c. The Distributed Learning Manual152 prepared by the DE Committee clarifies the policies and procedures in the college’s online program. Complete with sections “What Does this Mean for Me?” the manual offers an accessible and appropriate approach to online teaching.

d. Online classes are evaluated with the same criteria as traditional classes. This insures that the policies and procedures established by the college are being followed and technology is being used in an appropriate manner.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college encourages faculty and staff to actively incorporate appropriate technology into their teaching and learning processes. The 2014 LACCD Student Survey, reported that 92% of respondents either agree or strongly agree that “Instructors adequately use available technology in and out of the classroom.” Faculty and staff share techniques and strategies that encourage innovation.

Faculty are also committed to training their students in the use of technology. Instructors frequently schedule classes in computer labs, the library uses its online classroom for online research instruction, and many professors utilize turnitin.com for essay submissions. These uses of technology keep the class relevant but also provide technological experience for moving into the workplace or to the university.
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:

a. The college receives an allocation from the LACCD annually with adjustments made upward or downward during the year. The budget allocation model includes funds for administration, funding for maintenance and operations, a set aside for scheduled maintenance of its facilities in the unrestricted general fund and the restricted general funds. Although the college can always use more resources, the college attempts to operate within the allocation received in order to support its programs and services as evidenced by the ability of the college to accomplish its enrollment goals. In 2013 the LACCD restructured the allocation model for how funds are allocated to the colleges on an annual basis. In the past 3 years the college allocations and expenditures are as follows: http://albacore.laccd.edu/fis/budget_dev/

b. The College has an established participatory governance process to allocate resources through program review to request additional resources. All requests for additional resources must be a part of the department program review in order for it to be considered for funding. Resource requests from program review are separated by permanent staffing versus non-staffing requests. The shared governance committees of Human Resources, Budget and CPC committees have developed a process to prioritize resource requests that include a scoring rubric to measure the merit of each resource request. Each department and division ranks its resource requests using the rubric as a guide. Every member of the CPC is allowed to rank the resource requests and, while honoring the division rank, the CPC develops a comprehensive list of resource requests that is vetted through the entire college community provided to the college President as recommendations for implementation subject to available funding.

c. Total college resource sufficiency and sustainability is maintained by resources allocated from the LACCD, college-generated resources, and monies that are grant-based. All three areas are strictly monitored to assure institutional effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Allocation</td>
<td>29,308,197</td>
<td>29,564,584</td>
<td>31,556,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>29,182,830</td>
<td>29,207,002</td>
<td>31,555,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>125,367</td>
<td>357,582</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Despite the funding levels, the college has managed to balance its budget over the past 3 years by being prudent in how it allocates funds and by managing expenditures. The college has put into place systems to manage and track expenditures and ensure that it can balance the budget at the end of the fiscal year. It has also looked at increasing its revenue streams to ensure it can balance the budget.

e. The college prioritizes expenditures in its operational plan by first covering employee salaries and benefits, then it funds utilities and legally required expenses and finally it allocates its remaining balance to non-salary expenditures. The college then allocates these remaining funds to the items that have been prioritized by the college through its shared governance system.

f. The shared governance prioritization process ensures that proposed expenditures are needed and aligned with the mission and goals of the college. This ensures integrity and participation in the process by all college clusters. The integrity of how the moneys are allocated are reflected in the annual audit reports for the college.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college has formalized processes and practices to ensure that available financial resources are used to support student learning programs and services that improve the outcomes for students and the effectiveness of the institution. Although it is challenged nearly every fiscal year the college demonstrates sound financial planning and execution every year through meeting its enrollment targets within the budget allocated by the District. The allocation formula of the LACCD distributes resources based on enrollment and funding for key areas of the institution including maintenance and operations. The college has been making strides annually on the allocation of resources through its program review process, with improvements that are incorporated annually based on a yearly evaluation of the program review and resource allocation process. LAHC works as a cooperative team in good times and in bad times to meets its obligations within the confines of its budget. The College has demonstrated that, even during the time of substantial budget reductions, priorities were established to assure positive outcomes for students and the continued financial viability of the college.

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:

a. The College understands that evaluation and planning are crucial to sustainable quality improvement. To improve the link between financial and institutional planning, the college has developed the Harbor Assessment-Based Planning System (HAPS). The college mission and the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) are the focus for both assessment and institutional planning which then determine resource allocation.

b. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Assessment which is aligned with program review and unit plans identify the need for resources. As the requests are reviewed and prioritized, potential funding sources are identified such as general funds, categorical funds, or specific grant funds meeting funding guidelines.
c. Hiring requests are addressed through recommendations made to the President by the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee and the Human Resources Committee through CPC. Once a position has been approved, a position request form must be follow the chain of approval from the originating cluster through the Human Resources Committee, Budget Committee and CPC to the president for budget availability review and final approval.

d. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner via budget reports at shared governance meetings and at the Budget website.
   o Information is shared by all clusters about their area and how it is tied to budget and planning
   o Updates on budget changes are presented to the college constituencies at the beginning of the school year and periodically thereafter by the college president
   o In order to receive some of the BFAP STATE funding, Financial Aid office Personnel provides workshops to students on Budgeting and financial aid processing as well as providing Professional Learning opportunities with regard to default management and regulatory compliance through Training initiatives, webinars, meetings and conferences to Staff.
   o All employees have access to financial information through SAP (the LACCD enterprise system). Training is available annually to anyone interested in how to access financial information.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The financial planning process is driven by the college mission and the allocation of resources each year through the program review process. Clusters and departments link goals and planning directly to the college mission and the connection with mission is a component in measuring the strength of a resource request. All resources requested (personnel, supplies and equipment, increasing ongoing department needs) are prioritized and vetted through a campus participatory governance process as part of the program review process. The College has transparency in its budgeting processes. The college makes information readily available and reports and reviews its financial condition monthly to the college and the LACCD. Communication related to planning and budget occurs on a monthly basis with budget issues and decisions detailed in order to keep the campus informed. The college has increased the frequency and amount of financial information available for review on campus in recent years and takes the accountability for the management of its budget seriously and as a result has been able to balance its budget and meets it enrollment targets annually although considerable reliance on revenue sources other than the LACCD allocations is increasingly difficult to manage.

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:

a. Each year the Board of Trustees of LACCD establishes the budget calendar for the coming fiscal year. LAHC budget planning begins with each department reviewing the listing of full-time employees and budget line items for accuracy and reallocation.
b. Through the participatory governance process the entire college community has appropriate opportunities to participate in budget planning and development. Individuals in departments have the chance during program review to analyze and discuss information about the department including budgets. Additionally through the various committees all faculty and staff can access information on planning and budget through their constituency meetings.

c. The institution clearly defines its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development
   - Continuous process that is never perfect, that is why honest efforts, workshops and retreats are often put on to ensure a transparent process.
   - Three clusters work/adjust on their respective budget allocations based on internal priorities.

d. The institution follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development
   - Budget development begins with assessment and program review, program area plan requirements for those funded by categorical/special funds that drive unit plan development from the program areas, divisions and finally through cluster prioritization.
   - It is through this process that salary projects are analyzed and the budget preparation/input done first by the area administrator, followed by Office of Administrative Services who enters it into SAP, later adjusted by District Office/Business Area, where it goes through the approval process at the district to Board approval. This budget process results in the development of the local budget by fund center, which is adjusted throughout the year as funds are allocated as determined by the funder.

e. All constituencies have appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.
   - All clusters have the opportunity to participate in the development of institutional plans and budget on an annual basis. Divisions that report into clusters have to prepare a unit plan that feeds into a cluster plan and these plans are reflected in the development of the annual operations plan for the divisions.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The college financial planning and budget development process, which includes prioritizing resource requests is well established at LAHC. Institutional planning coordination takes place through a variety of committees which have a broad range of employee representation and participation. The opportunity to participate exists throughout the fiscal and school year.

The development of a multi-year budget projection supports future forecasting, thereby, determining impact existing budget transactions have on college overall operating budget while affording sufficient time to plan and adjust for unforeseen circumstances. This is especially necessary when considering the competing needs of state wide legislation, federal, state and local initiatives, district and resulting competing timelines.

**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:**

a. Unit plans are developed and updated continuously by all clusters, working areas and divisions

b. Budget information is communicated to LAHC through a hierarchal manner president, vice president, dean/manager, staff, etc. The accuracy of the information is verifiable in SAP to help reconcile discrepancies.

c. Monthly Budget Committee Meetings
   - minutes
   - monthly projections for month prior

d. Weekly budget update at Senior Staff

e. Quarterly cluster budget report-sent to VP’s from Admin Services

f. Clusters submit priorities (ranked by cluster) to CPC who then ranks them and submits them to President as recommendations for funding.

g. The District Budget Committee decisions that impact the college budget are reflected in monthly reports and discussed at weekly Senior staff meetings

h. Although the College relies on the District to provide resources for its general operations LAHC has a very active program to secure non-general fund revenue sources. There are several departments who have developed entrepreneurial opportunities in their departments and have been able to generate additional resources by offering services, testing and certifications that have a fee associated with it. Departments are allowed to keep these funds and use them for department needs. The College is in partnership with several agencies to deliver contracted education. These additional resources are a part of the unrestricted general fund. The Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Workforce Development has been very successful applying for and being awarded major grant funding that helps programs and the college as a whole innovate it offerings and services.

i. If additional resources become available throughout the year that were not anticipated, the previously noted budget and financial planning process would seek to allocate these new resources consistent with the articulated needs of the college and the latest operational plans

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

College planning is based on evaluating the resources available that are prioritized to meet the objectives of the College. The focus on instruction is core to the planning process of the institution. Protecting instruction through the challenging budget reductions has been very challenging on the administrative functions of the college but overall it has been successfully accomplished by the college. When additional resources become available, the shared governance process has significant input in to how those funds should be allocated. The College practices fair distribution of resources based on its objectives. The College has been successful in generating additional review through its enterprise programs and grant funding for many of its programs. This should also provide a framework for the allocation of resources in times of additional funding as well as in times of reduced funding.
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:

a. The District has well-established and appropriate control mechanisms 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.

b. The College reports its monthly financial status to the District and the College in order to assure that it is making sound financial decisions and responsibly using its resources. In addition the College completes a quarterly financial and enrollment report that is sent to the District and to the State; the College Executive Team and the District Executive Team meet to review the quarterly financial status and compare projections on enrollment and budget.

c. The College and LACCD has internal controls for its handling of financial transactions and that is reviewed and updated annually and subject to internal audit within the district.

d. Each department of the College has the ability to manage its budget with access to the budget transfer and purchase order system. Controls are in place relative to limited permissions and required approvals to assure financial integrity and accountability; the Vice President Administrative Services is the final approver. The College is following District guidelines as there have been no significant internal or external audit findings in many years.

e. 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)

f. 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 Rule 7900); (III.D.5-5 Board Rule 7900.10-7900.12); (III.D.5-6 Presentation of audit to BOT)

g. 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)

h. 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)

i. 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)

j. 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)

k. 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)

l. 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)

m. 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.

The College has processes and procedures in place to ensure proper controls in handling its resources. Manuals have been developed and are readily available. All faculty and staff have access to the budget system. Training occurs on an annual basis, available to all faculty and staff, in how to access budget information and every year each department receives information on the detail of its budgets to review for accuracy and reallocation of non-salary items.

**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

**Standard III.D.6**

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:**

a. Financial documents have a high degree of credibility and accuracy. Monthly projections are now reviewed with the VPAS each month before submission. The VPAS approves all budget movements during the fiscal year and actively communicates the budget status with other members of senior staff.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
Each month the College reports its projected financial status for the year. These reports are reviewed each month senior staff and the information has recently been provided to the Budget Committee within the shared governance process as the start of a new activity. The College has demonstrated through its practices that instruction is the primary focus along with the support needed for students to be successful. The College respects the department prioritization of resource requests through the process because it is assumed the department and division have the best information about their needs.

**Standard III.D.7**  
Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely and communicated appropriately.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

- LACCD undergoes an external audit annually, with the College receiving from the District office the list of any audit findings for the college to prepare the corrective action plan. The College has received no external audit findings in recent years. However, if in the future there are findings, the College will respond comprehensive and timely and communicate the findings and corrective action plan through the Budget and CPC committees.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The College has had no audit findings from external auditors in recent years. Audit reports are available on the College website. In order to disseminate the audit findings to the wider campus community, beginning in summer 2015 audit findings will be reported out to the CPC and meeting minutes and supporting documents are posted on the college website.

**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:**

- 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).

- 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
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
- III.D.8-19 – SAP Business Warehouse Time Screenshot
- III.D.8-21 – ACCJC letter to District, 7/3/13
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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2016 Budget</th>
<th>2014-2015 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$2.87 billion</td>
<td>$2.96 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop A, AA &amp; Measure J Bonds in the building fund</td>
<td>$1.61 billion</td>
<td>$1.87 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$929.58 million</td>
<td>$751.52 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted General Fund</td>
<td>$745.18 million</td>
<td>$618.61 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2014</th>
<th>June 30, 2013*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net position</td>
<td>$743.6 million</td>
<td>$700.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted net position</td>
<td>$34.7 million</td>
<td>$19.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted net position</td>
<td>$295.5 million</td>
<td>$238 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and other assets (not capital)</td>
<td>$906 million</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Balances presented as restated due to implementation of GASB Statement No. 65

b. (III.D.9-4 LACCD Financial Audit, June 30, 2014, p.6)

c. 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)

d. 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)
e. 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

f. 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)

g. 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)

h. 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)

i. 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)

j. 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)

k. 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

l. 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)

m. 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)

n. 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)

o. 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)

p. 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. The District, and therefore the college, are well-positioned to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. In addition the College has demonstrated that in times of fiscal constraint, the college community comes together to determine budget reductions. The processes are transparent and open for all to participate. 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.

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
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 the 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)
1. 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. At the college level the Associate Vice President and Vice President of Administrative Services reviews the status of all funds on a quarterly basis and report any concerns to each area vice president. This report had been an informal report among the vice presidents.

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:

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.

The first step to ensure that the District maintains financial solvency is by ensuring that all obligations are identified with accurate valuations. The District systematically identifies and evaluates its obligations on an annual basis. When needed, third party actuaries are engaged to establish the amounts of the obligations. These obligations are summarized in the District’s audit report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2014.

As of June 30, 2014, the District’s total net position is $743.6 million, which is an increase of $43.1 million over June 30, 2013. This continues a history of positive net position. As of June 30, 2014 the District’s working capital (current assets minus current liability) is $132.9 million, with a cash and cash equivalent balance of $138.6 million. If taking into consideration the debt and interest payments made by Los Angeles County on behalf of the District, working capital increases to $273.9 million ($132.9M + current portion of interest payable $87.3M + current portion of long-term debt $53.7M) (III.D.11-2 LACCD Fiscal Audit Report June 30, 2014: Net Financial Position).

Analysis and Evaluation:

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.
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.

The OPEB plan obligations for the District are based on negotiated contracts with the various bargaining units of the LACCD. The contribution requirements are established and may be amended by the District and the District’s bargaining units. The District follows the reporting requirements of GASB Statement No. 45, “Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions.”

In order for the District to fulfill its obligations, the required contribution is based on projected pay as you go financing requirements. Additionally, the District’s Board of Trustees adopted a resolution dated April 23, 2008 (Com. No. BF2) to establish an irrevocable trust with CalPERS to prefund a portion of plan costs (III.D.12-1-BOT Resolution to Establish OPEB Irrevocable Trust). The District funds the trust at a rate of approximately 1.92% of the total full-time salary expenditures of the District. Additionally, the District will direct an amount equivalent to the federal Medicare Part D subsidy returned to the District each year into the trust fund. The District deposited $7,206,829 to the irrevocable trust with CalPERS during FY2014. As of June 30, 2014 the District has set aside approximately $49.9 million, in the OPEB trust fund. The fair value of the trust fund as of June 30, 2014 was approximately $69.6 million. The District’s net OPEB obligation as of June 30, 2014 was $63.1 million (III.D.12-2-LACCD Fiscal Audit Report June 30, 2014: OPEB Trust).

The District has also 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 $1,000,000 per employment practices claim. 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 at June 30, 2014 includes estimates of future claim payments for known cases as well as provisions for incurred but not reported claims and adverse development on known cases that occurred through that date (III.D.12-3-LACCD Fiscal Audit Report June 30, 2014: Workers’ Compensation; III.D.12-4-LACCD Workers’ Compensation Actuarial Report).

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. As of June 30, 2015, this current value of this trust fund is $76.8 million. (III.D.12-6 Board agenda and minutes, Com. No. BF2, 4/23/2008); (III.D.12-7 CalPERS Quarterly Financial Statement, 6/30/15)

h. 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).

i. 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).

j. 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).

k. 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.

Because actual claim liabilities depend on complex factors such as inflation, changes in legal doctrines, and damage awards, the process used in computing claims liability does not necessarily result in an exact amount. Liabilities for incurred losses to be settled by fixed or reasonably determinable payments 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 District’s current workers’ compensation liability is $5 million. The District’s strong financial position covers these obligations.

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
III.D.12-7 – CalPERS Quarterly Financial Statement, 6/30/15
III.D.12-8 – BR 101001.5
III.D.12-9 – BR 101020

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.

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.

The District receives financial resources from many sources, including but not limited to, general obligation construction bonds (Bonds) and auxiliary activities (i.e. bookstore, cafeteria). The District
has issued 3 series of Bonds. Proposition A authorized in 2001, Proposition AA authorized in 2003 and Measure J authorized in 2008. The expenditure of Bond proceeds and resulting construction activity is subject to annual financial and performance audits by KPMG LLP. The audits ensure that construction activities follow established government regulations, policies and procedures as well as industry best practices. The District has received unqualified opinions for both performance and financial audits (III.D.14-1-LACCD Bond Audits).

In addition to the Bond audits, the District is subject to annual audits over its financial statements and internal controls. This audit reviews financial information and internal controls for all campuses, departments and funds of the District excluding the Foundations. An unqualified audit opinion has been issued since 2002 (III.D.14-2-LACCD Audit Opinions).

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. Internal audits for LAHC have resulted in some areas of weaknesses being identified and corrective action plans have been implemented to address any deficiencies.

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
III.D.14-8 – Administrative Regulations S-1 to S-7
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
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 IVA.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 process are used to assure effective planning and implementation.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. Decision-making at Harbor College encourages creativity and is also methodical and inclusive. Improvements in practice, programs, and services are initiated primarily through the assessment process that identifies improvement areas that are reflected within the program review. The program review’s identification of these areas and possible improvement strategies (which often entail innovative ideas) are then included in the unit plan and go forward the appropriate cluster or evaluative committee.

b. Examples include:

   ○ The Life Skills Center addresses the social and mental health needs of students. The Center originally began with a mental health grant that was supported by DSPS and Student Services. The Center expanded and has now been institutionalized with the hiring of a Life Skills Director.
   ○ Turnitin.com Similarly, faculty from various disciplines identified the limited writing skills of many students. The Student Success Committee and Academic Affairs reviewed the proposal for the purchase of turnitin.com which enables faculty to check plagiarism and to more easily identify grammatical errors.
   ○ STEM Grant Harbor’s current STEM grant grew out of a recognition that students needed research opportunities in order to thrive in the math and science fields. This idea was vetted before an advisory committee before being considered by Academic Affairs.

c. The College also identified the need to streamline its planning process which was completed with through a methodical process of development, review, pilot, and validation. The College Planning Council (CPC) formed a Planning Taskforce in spring 2015 for the purpose of reviewing the planning process. Taskforce members met throughout the summer and with the leadership of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness developed an assessment-based planning system that incorporates assessment into program review and unit planning. The revised planning process was piloted in fall 2015 and the results were validated at the end of the fall semester. CPC reviewed the pilot results and approved the college going forward college-wide implementation of the program.

Analysis and Evaluation:
The college encourages innovation that leads to improvement in practices, programs, and services. New ideas are vetted through the shared governance process to assure effective planning and implementation. The college meets this standard.

**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:**

a. Harbor College’s *Participatory Governance Agreement* specifies the way in which individuals may introduce ideas into the shared governance process for further development. Article IV Section 3 of the *Agreement* clarifies the students’ role on shared governance committees and delineates the areas of student influence in the governance process. Student attendance is affirmed by long-standing Association of Students (ASO) procedures that specifically assign student leaders to governance and planning committees. Student participation is documented on the standardized template for committee participants.

b. The President’s Cabinet which meets weekly to advise the CEO includes the ASO President to ensure that student are always informed on college issues. The LACCD Board also includes a Student Trustee that is elected from one of the nine campuses to represent students at the District.

c. Student representation is strong on issues that specifically impact students. For example, decisions regarding the college’s offering of winter or summer class sessions elicit strong student input from ASO representatives and their constituents. Student support significantly contributed to the college’s decision to offer class session in summer 2015 and winter 2016. Similarly, the college decision regarding the final phases of bond spending brought clear support for constructing a new student center as opposed to remodeling an older administration building.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
The shared governance structure includes administrators, faculty, staff, and students in the decision-making processes. Student participation and a student voice in areas of interest are expected and encouraged. All constituents are encouraged to bring ideas forward for the purpose of impacting policy and planning. The college meets this standard.

**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:

a. The roles of administrators and faculty in the development of District policy are delineated in Board Rules Chapter XVII, Article I—Academic Senate and Board of Trustees Shared Governance Policy; Article II Students and Board of Trustee Shared Governance Policy; and Chancellor's Directive No 70. The AFT/LACCD Collective Bargaining Agreement requires faculty representation on governance and planning committees and makes faculty participation on these committees a criterion in faculty evaluation.

b. Harbor College’s Participatory Governance Agreement and the Planning Policy and Procedure Manual detail the roles of all constituencies in planning and budget development. Prior to 2014 the college constituencies developed operational plans that were forward to the College Planning Council (CPC) for prioritization and integration into a College Annual Plan. The Budget Committee then structured a budget to implement the CPC decisions.

c. The planning process gives voice to faculty and/or administrative expertise. Athletics, for example, prioritized the hiring of a Women’s Cross-Country coach in its unit plan. The Kinesiology faculty weighed in on the importance of expanding the women’s sports program in the Human Resources Committee; the Administrative Vice-President supported the hire based on Title IX requirements. Based upon unit planning and the expertise of faculty and administrators the hire was approved.

d. In January 2014, CPC evaluated its planning process and worked to implement recommendations, streamline the process, and direct all planning toward fulfillment of the college mission. The revised model more fully incorporates the college’s ongoing assessment work into unit planning and provides administrators and faculty with substantive data on which decisions may be based. The revised model articulates the four goals of the mission within the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). Each of these four goals may be measured by the relevant constituencies and integrated into program review and unit planning.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college meets this standard through policies and procedures that give administrators and faculty a defined role in college planning and budget. These roles relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise and with the revised planning model support this expertise with data.

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:
a. The Curriculum Committee and the Assessment Committee of the Academic Senate, as well as the Student Success Coordinating Committee report regularly to the Academic Senate and CPC and make recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.

b. Lead faculty with expertise in specific disciplines are primarily responsible for curricular updates or additions. For the college as a whole, a designated Dean oversees curriculum along with the Curriculum Committee Chair and the Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator, both of whom are provided with release time for their work. The Director of the Library and Learning Resource Center oversees academic support services and the Vice-President of Student Services oversees the assessment of service area programs. These leaders make recommendations to the Senate and CPC and, based upon their approval, implement curricular and programmatic change.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The college meets this standard and provides for curricular and student learning programs that begin at the discipline level and are then recommended, reviewed, and implemented through a shared governance process.

**Standard IVA.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:**

a. The representative make-up of all shared governance committees (*Participatory Governance Agreement*) insure that relevant perspectives, including individuals with specific expertise and responsibility, are considered in the decision-making process.

b. The Council Planning Council (CPC), the committee responsible for college planning and policy, includes representatives from all four college constituencies (faculty, staff, students, and administrators) and is co-chaired by the President of the Academic Senate and the Vice-President of Administrative Services who provide a joint academic-operational perspective. The co-chair of the Student Success Coordinating Committee (SSCC) which includes administrators, faculty, and staff also oversees the college’s student success initiatives. Her leadership on SSCC clearly keeps her in touch with relevant perspectives that impact decision-making.

c. Other sub-committees of the Academic Senate include representatives from each academic division. The Distance Education Committee includes representatives from the faculty and student services, administrators, and the Library and Learning Resource Center. Similarly, the Grants committee includes faculty, administrators, and student services. In the 2015 update to the *Grants Committee Manual* the Senate also placed a representative from the Technology Advising Committee (TAC) and WEC (Work Environment Committee) onto the Grants Committee to insure that relevant technology and facilities perspectives would be presented in grant deliberations.
d. The Bond Steering Committee (CORE) which makes recommendations on A, AA, and J Bond expenditures is tri-chaired by a faculty member, the director of college facilities, and the project manager. Representatives from each of these constituencies also serve on CORE to insure diverse and relevant perspectives on construction decisions. 
https://effectiveness.lahc.edu/cpc/CORE/SitePages/Home.aspx

e. The CEO meets monthly with the classified staff representatives. The four presidents of the campus bargaining units meets to discuss college issues, new programs, and services. At the suggestion of this leadership group the college instituted a Classified Employee of the Year award which boosts morale as well as communicating to the campus the important contribution of classified staff. Other more informal events such as recognition luncheons, and professional development activities also promote college-wide ideals and perspectives.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college meets this standard by ensuring that all shared governance committees include representatives from a variety of constituencies that provide diverse and relevant perspectives in the decision-making process. Responsibilities are aligned with experts to accomplish effective planning, policies, and relevant curriculum.

**Standard IVA.6**
The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. The processes for decision-making are outlined in the *Planning Policy and Procedure Manual*. The *Manual* also presents a revised planning diagram that illustrates the planning process. *Academic Senate Constitution* delineates the responsibilities, structures, and procedures of the Senate. Both documents are posted on their respective sites.

b. The college’s use of SharePoint software provides better organization and more accessibility to this information (manuals, agendas, and minutes). Accessibility also means a broader spectrum of contributors are able to update information and maintain currency.

c. The campus leadership clarify and communicate college decisions via LAHC-ALL. For example, when the CEO and CPC approved the 2016 Winter Session, the CEO communicated with the college, explained the process for making the decision along with the benefit for students and the fiscal responsibility. The CEO’s Opening Day “State of the College” presentation initiates a series of presidential updates provided throughout the year. http://www.lahc.edu/ ; http://www.lahc.edu/ottolee.html

d. After the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee has completed its review of hiring requests and presented their recommendations to the Academic Senate for approval, the list is published to inform the campus about potential hires in the upcoming year.
Analysis and Evaluation:

The college meets this standard. Its processes for decision-making are widely shared across the college via LAHC ALL, regular updates provided by the president, and regular reports from campus leaders at campus-wide events.

Standard IVA.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:

a. The College’s evaluation of its governance and decision-making policies, procedures and processes occurs with committee evaluations and the periodic review of its manuals and shared governance documents. In 2013 for example, the Senate Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (SAPPC) reviewed and updated the Academic Senate Constitution. One of the revisions included the designation of an individual to post Senate information on the college website.

b. In 2014 following a February College Planning Council (CPC) retreat and an evaluation of the college’s planning cycle and documents, recommendations from the planning retreat were presented and discussed at CPC meetings throughout fall 2014. Discussions resulted in the formation of a Planning Taskforce that was organized to review and streamline the current planning process.

c. Working throughout summer 2015, the taskforce aligned the college goals with those of the LACCD and the College Mission and implemented these goals through the Strategic Educational Master Plan. The taskforce presented an integrated planning model based upon assessment results that are then reflected in program review and unit planning. The plan was presented to CPC for review and approved for a pilot study that was conducted in fall 2015. Upon completion of the pilot in November 2015, CPC again reviewed its evaluation and implementation campus-wide in spring 2016. The original Planning Taskforce ended and a second taskforce took up the task of revising the existing Planning and Procedure Manual to reflect the revisions of the past year.

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college meets this standard and evaluates its governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes through committee evaluations that are completed as part of the planning process. In order to further improve and use the evaluations as the basis for improvement, the college will
implement a campus-wide review of the channels of communication and improved means for implementing suggested changes.
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:

a. Dr. Otto Lee was appointed as chief executive officer (CEO) of Los Angeles Harbor College in June 2014 and began work in August 2014. Prior to Dr. Lee’s appointment, the position was held by Interim CEO Mr. Farley Herzek in 2013-2014 and Mr. Marvin Martinez 2010-2013 respectively. As CEO Dr. Lee assumes primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. His leadership is evidenced in the following areas:

- **Planning** The CEO’s leadership has invigorated the college’s integrated and ongoing planning and resource allocation process as outlined in an updated version of the College Planning Policy and Procedures Manual. ([Planning Policy & Procedures Manual](#)). The CEO has strengthened the college’s use of program review data as the foundation for unit planning and resource allocation. Dr. Lee also encouraged the development of a timeline to track planning flow and more directly link planning to resource allocation.

- **Organization** The CEO’s direction on integrated planning at the unit, cluster, and college levels, in addition to the timely presentation of the college functional plans, has provided for a broader exchange of information, a stronger and ongoing dialogue between constituencies, and incorporation of relevant data into the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). The revised SEMP more clearly aligns with the LACCD Strategic goals, objectives, and measures.

- **Budget** The CEO provides leadership and direction in resource planning and allocation. The CEO meets weekly with senior administrators to monitor operational expenditures, to provide oversight of salary and benefit expenditures, and to ensure that budgetary decisions are transparent and thoroughly vetted within the planning process. The CEO actively encourages campus programs to pursue external funding through grants. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development has generated $14,947,478 in grant monies in support of college goals and its mission. Budget is a standing item on the Senior Staff agenda which provides opportunity for the Administrative Services vice-president to report recommendations from the Budget Committee, to monitor expenditures in specific departments, and if needed implement cost-saving strategies. Renewed oversight (managing enrollment and shifting staffing schedules) of the Child Development Center has resulted in a surplus for 2014-15.

The CEO meets weekly with campus leadership at the President’s Cabinet to update the group on the latest district, campus and community priorities. The CEO also meets monthly with the Academic Senate President and union representatives’ pursuant to
contractual requirements to address campus matters including budget. The CEO also works with LACCD Board, the Chancellor, and District Budget Committee (DBC) to strongly advocate for college in terms of budget development.

b. **Personnel selection and development** The CEO works within the defined shared governance structure to determine personnel selection and development in support of the college mission. Personnel decisions are an integral part of the planning and resource allocation process at Harbor College.

For faculty hiring the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC) examines hiring proposals that are based on program review and unit data analysis. FHPC prioritizes faculty positions and with the approval of the Academic Senate forwards them to the CEO. In response to an ACCJC recommendation the selection of classified personnel has been further clarified and follows a procedure similar to that assigned to FHPC.

The Human Resources Committee identifies classified positions, clears them through the Personnel Commission, and makes recommendations to CPC. The CEO is ultimately responsible for all personnel decisions but these decisions are based upon recommendations provided by the faculty and shared governance committees which are then aligned with the Faculty Obligation Number (FON) and budget considerations.

The CEO encourages personnel training and development. For administrators the CEO encourages professional growth and career development by shifting existing administrators into interim positions of vice-president and dean. These strategic placements nurture the leadership skills of future administrators. The college also supports training for classified personnel and a variety of professional development activities for faculty, including the Culturally Responsive Training and district Teaching & Learning Academy (FTLA). The CEO’s leadership stimulates faculty to fully engage in the shared governance process.

c. **Assessment of institutional effectiveness:** The Office of Institutional Effectiveness collects and provides data to the CEO for analysis. Based upon this data and its alignment with the LACCD’s Strategic Plan, the college articulated four major goals, objectives, and specific measures within the college’s 2014-17 Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). Use of these measures, along with the measurement of Institution Set Standards, are the primary ways that the CEO insures the overall assessment of institutional effectiveness. For example, the college’s evaluation of persistence and completion data provided through the Achieving the Dream Initiative and Equity Program focused the college on disproportionately impacted students and led to the creation of the Champs Program in support of these success goals for student Athletes’.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

In spite of significant changes in administrative leadership over the last three years, the CEO upheld the primary leadership responsibilities for the college and continues to promote the quality of the institution. Based on data from the Scorecard, and AtD the college has aligned the SSSP and Equity plans to support student success. As a result the college has made significant milestones and attained Leader College status within the Achieving the Dream network by moving the needle on completion and developing specific interventions to target disadvantaged populations. The math pathway has been shortened to accommodate a smoother bridge from basic skills course to college level math. Other front
door interventions have led to a scaling up of the college’s first year experience program, Harbor Advantage and increasing persistence and graduation rates. The college meets this standard.

**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:**

a. **Planning**
The number of administrators on the college staff is determined by the LACCD Allocation Model and is overseen by the CEO. The CEO organizes the administrative structure and tasks each vice-president or dean to achieve the college mission in the most efficient way possible.

The administrative structure at Harbor College includes three vice presidents (Academic, Student Support, and Administrative Services), nine deans and their support staff. The number of deans is a testament to the college’s robust activity with external funding and leveraging grant funded positions. Administrative responsibilities are determined primarily by the bargaining unit agreements. All administrative hires were included within the planning process of the preceding year.

b. **Oversight**
The CEO delegates authority to administrators in a manner that is consistent with policies and procedures as described in the *Participatory Governance Agreement* and the Collective Bargaining Agreements. Responsibilities are also assigned as needed including specific accreditation responsibilities that are assigned to administrators by the CEO.
c. **Evaluation**

The Chancellor and the CEO, through this delegation of authority from the Board of Trustees, consult collegially with the faculty academic senates, the collective bargaining organizations, and the Associated Students Organizations on all policies and decisions as specified in the Board Rules. The CEO’s annual evaluation of administrators examines job performance and assures accountability. Evaluations also provide an opportunity for administrators to articulate college goals and a framework for implementation within program review and planning processes. This is also true for deans who articulate their goals every year, align them with the
broader college mission, and reflect upon them during evaluation leading to continuous change and improvement. This is done through the Job Duty Statement and annual LACCD Administrator’s Performance Evaluation process. (LACCD Administrators Contract) The CEO is held accountable for oversight, planning, and evaluating staff and faculty by the bargaining agreements and the various representatives and officers of these units. As evidence, see for example, Articles 19 and 42 of the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The college meets this standard with an administrative structure that is appropriately staffed for the size of the institution. The CEO oversees this structure, delegates’ authority as necessary, and holds individuals accountable for their duties. Further evidence of the colleges’ financial stability is its strength and effectiveness in grant awards as a result of careful monitoring and successful outcomes.

**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:**

The CEO leads the college toward teaching and learning improvement with the following policies and procedures:

a. **A collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities:** The CEO encourages a data-driven collegiality that focuses the college on accomplishing its mission. The CEO’s regular communications provide encouragement for faculty and staff and conclude with the phrase, “Thank you for all you do. Our students deserve the very best.” Formally the CEO communicates the campus vision at Opening Day, graduation ceremonies, award ceremonies, and town hall meetings. The CEO also reports regularly to both CPC and Senate and in town hall meetings (Harbor Success Days), in weekly meetings of the President’s Cabinet, and in weekly Accreditation Steering Committee meetings. The CEO has also invited the Chancellor to speak on the LACCD values and goals as they align with the campus-wide goals of Harbor College.

b. **College set institutional performance standards for student achievement:** With the direction of the CEO and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the college established a clearer link between existing data and its analysis of Institution Set Standards. The set standards now provide the measures utilized in program review and the basis for generating improvement plans. The college shifted its processes of program review and planning onto SharePoint which contributes to greater data accessibility and flexibility.
c. **Evaluation and planning based on quality research and analysis:** The CEO actively encourages the college to evaluate and use data in all of its decisions. The CEO hired a Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (May 2015) and a second research analyst (April 2015) to support the research needs of the campus.

- **Research** Throughout spring 2015 the newly hired Dean presented the college Scorecard and explained its implications to all shared governance committees and led a CPC-designated taskforce to review past evaluations of planning and to better align the 2014-17 [Strategic Educational Master Plan](#) (SEMP) with LACCD strategic goals and the college mission.

- **Data Analysis** In 2014, College analysis of Achieving the Dream data, both external and internal, initially led to the organization of a First Year Experience then Harbor Advantage program based on a learning community model. Analysis of this data within the program clarifies the link between research, data analysis, and student achievement. Data from the Harbor Advantage program documents that participating students demonstrated higher course retention (99%), successful course completion (89%), and average units completed (9.7) as compared to non-participants (83% retention), (69% course completion), (6.9% average units completed). Harbor Advantage students also maintained a higher GPA 2.7 as compared to non-participants 2.4.

d. **Educational planning integrated with resource planning**

With the leadership of the CEO, college-wide planning has undergone a process of alignment and improvement since 2012. The CEO’s oversight of the SEMP in addition to the assessment of learning outcomes and Institution Set Standards provide a framework for analyzing student achievement and learning. Program review and unit planning are rooted in this data.

**Educational Planning** The college planning process starts with review of learning and service area outcomes measured by the SEMP and Institution Set Standards. Improvement strategies are then evaluated, aligned, and prioritized within the resource allocation. This review process has aligned planning and resource allocation within institutional goals and objectives as developed and refined each year.

**Resource Planning** From 2012 on, the primary goals at the college have been to support and measure the impacts of access and student success, completion, economic and workforce development, basic skills instruction, fiscal stability and the allocation of resources in a manner that prioritizes these goals to support the needs of our diverse communities ([College Mission Statement](#)).

e. **Allocation of resources in support of learning and achievement**

As noted above the allocation of resources is directly tied to ongoing review of outcomes and in turn to student learning and achievement. For example, the college’s [Enrollment Management Plan](#) has led to a strategically monitored class schedule that ensures students are provided with classes and an overall learning environment (including student support and facilities) to support their success. Development of new programs also reflect support for learning and achievement. Global Logistics is a new degree identified by community need and Business Department program review leading to this new career pathway for students interested in pursuing a profession in this growing field.
f. **Procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning to achieve the mission**

The college increasingly recognizes the importance of planning for the mission but also evaluating its processes along the way.

In 2012-13 CPC conducted a planning retreat and evaluation of its planning process. Since that evaluation with the support of the CEO the college has further integrated student and service area outcomes into its program review that are then measured by the SEMP. This ongoing refinement is a testament to the college's willingness to honestly evaluate itself and embrace change that points toward the mission.

Grant and state-funded programs are regularly audited by both internal and external means. Audits provide opportunities to review and evaluate a specific program’s impact. Campus committees complete written self-evaluations of their specific roles in planning. Committee-wide review of these evaluations clarifies the link between a committee’s specific role and the broader mission of the college. The college also conducts a climate survey that allows the campus population to evaluate the process and progress of the college toward its mission.

The process of revising the mission statement itself was driven by a re-evaluation of the college’s values and priorities. Throughout the months of January, February and March 2015 the mission statement was vetted through the shared governance process which caused the college community to hone in on its central values, goals, and priorities.

This vision-forward campus and civic focus transcends to the college’s future leaders as seen through the increased participation of our growing student government organization and their support of campus-wide initiatives to community-wide advocacy as evidenced through the foundation of the first Rotaract Club. The Service Learning program engages a variety of students in community service that is integrated with their coursework. Other campus clubs sponsor food, toy, and blood drives for local organizations.

The CEO and other campus leaders represent the campus at civic events like the Wilmington Christmas Parade and the Golden Apple Awards sponsored by the Lomita Chamber of Commerce to honor excellence in teaching.

The CEO aligns and articulates his own vision and goals with that of the college within his own self-assessment and evaluation conducted by the District Chancellor on an annual basis. All together these events work to promote a collegial process with student success as its highest priority.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**

The CEO follows and improves upon established policies and procedures particularly if they contribute to achievement of the mission. Decisions for improvement are informed by data analysis and linked to resource planning and allocation. Evaluations by divisions and units in light of the college mission help the campus community identify its strengths and weaknesses as well as those resources to promote student success and channel money into outreach, curriculum development and intentional retention activities. The college meets this standard.
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:

a. The CEO’s leadership role has been integral to a successful self-study process at Harbor College. Given the short time period between the submission of Harbor College’s 2015 Mid-term Report and the 2016 Self Evaluation, the CEO encouraged the college to establish a sustained climate of accreditation. This vision prompted the evaluation of the various standards to occur within the college’s existing committee structures and to more fully integrate accreditation ideals into college work and activity. The CEO’s focus on the self-study process as a tool for improvement is a tribute to this leadership role.

b. The CEO and Accreditation Steering Committee Team leaders provide clarification, continual updates and guidance for the college in regular presentations to the Academic Senate, the CPC, and the three Clusters, and also in more general settings such as Opening Day or in Harbor Success Day events. At Opening Day 2015 the CEO highlighted the importance of accreditation and spearheaded a workshop “How to Speak Accreditation” that clarified the new accreditation standards and resulting terminology. The workshop was followed by a short video “The Top 10 of Accreditation” that was shown in division meetings. At the administrative level, including the deans, the operational responsibilities of accreditation are discussed and assigned.

c. The CEO assures compliance with accreditation requirements by working with the various college committees and bargaining units to develop the college mission, direct and provide focus to accomplish that mission. When necessary the CEO recommends the formation of taskforces (Budget and Planning) to directly address accreditation issues that result in policy and procedure revisions and continued improvement.

d. Faculty, staff, students and administrators are encouraged to attend professional development and training provided by the District, the state Academic Senate, and the ACCJC with a focus on accreditation (Accreditation Project Plan). These participants regularly report back to campus.

e. The CEO encourages campus participation in accreditation presentations and activities (Invitation to Board of Trustees Presentation).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The college meets this standard and its CEO assumes primary responsibility for the college’s accreditation. The CEO clearly communicates to faculty, staff, students and administrators those issues regarding compliance with accreditation.
**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:**

a. The CEO is knowledgeable regarding the statutes, regulations and governing board policies. This knowledge is implemented at the college and district levels.

b. The findings and reports of the District Budget Committee, for instance, indicate the effectiveness of budgetary planning and controls at the college. Likewise, the college’s own Budget Committee brings to light what is working and what requires improvement. Policy areas are also covered through regular meetings with the AFT chapter president and other bargaining unit leaders.

c. Funding for national and statewide Student Success Initiatives (ATD, Basic Skills, 3SPN, and Equity) have been integrated and aligned with the planning process and budget allocations.

**Analysis and Evaluation:**
The CEO clearly understands the statutes, regulations, governing board policies ensuring and upholding the college mission throughout their implementation. The college meets this standard.

**Standard IV.B.6**
The CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard:**

a. The CEO works and communicates with the community to determine how college programs and services can address community needs and establish potential collaborations that would benefit the community. The CEO communicates through various venues (regular meetings, events, and individual visits either in the community or on campus). Harbor College’s new program in Global Logistics is an example of this collaboration. CEO discussions with organizations such as the Port of LA, AltaSea, and the local high schools identified that the future vision for the Port of LA would require workers trained in global trade and logistics. Hence, the college’s effort to develop and offer that program to the community.

b. The Citizen Oversight Committee[^161] for the three bond measures is composed of a variety of community representatives who provide direction and oversight to bond expenditures. As the bond program enters its final stages the necessity for CORE input has lessened. The committee however continues to meet periodically insure the community’s connection with the building program.

[^161]: The Citizen Oversight Committee
c. The college also actively interfaces with local high schools, 4-year colleges and universities, Los Angeles City government and local industries including the Port of Los Angeles. A Los Angeles County Sheriff’s substation is also housed on the Harbor campus. The Sheriff’s Department provides training as well as enforcement outreach to the Wilmington community. Others community collaborations include the vocal and locally active community and campus advisory boards (EOPS Department Webpage\textsuperscript{162}).

d. CalWORKS Department Webpage\textsuperscript{163}.

e. Harbor Teacher Preparation Academy\textsuperscript{164}. (Link to EOPS/CalWORKs, HTPA & EWD advisory board meeting agendas and minutes)

f. The CEO communicates with all stakeholders through campus-wide events, such as Harbor Success Day, including student events and town halls. The CEO maintains communication with emails monthly e-mail updates to the entire campus and by regular reports to CPC and the Academic Senate.

g. In fall 2015, the CEO organized a community outreach event to solicit input from the community on the Self-Evaluation Study and to clarify the college’s ongoing accreditation efforts.

h. Through the leadership of the CEO, the Harbor College Foundation\textsuperscript{165} is being revitalized to develop stronger community ties. The Foundation will facilitate a planning retreat on September 12, 2015.

\textbf{Analysis and Evaluation:} 

The CEO actively seeks to identify and understand the needs of Harbor College’s South Bay community through data and first hand interaction with community leaders and organizations. This regular interaction leads to effective communication with the community, the establishment of new programs to address community needs, and deeper roots in the areas the college serves. The college meets this standard.
# HOW TO SPEAK ACCREDITATION-OPENING DAY WORKSHOP
## AUGUST 27, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Rationale</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal requirements for educational institutions communicated and enforced through the ACCJC</td>
<td>Means of examining what we do well and not so well; promotes self-examination and assures level of accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Process</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-year cycle of self-evaluation, report writing, submission, visit, ACCJC review, midterm updates</td>
<td>Completion of Midterm 2015. Full Self-Evaluation Study 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Status</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaffirmation, Warning, Probation, Show Cause</td>
<td>Accreditation reaffirmed-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Standards</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four major criteria for college-wide success established by the ACCJC and proven in the self-study.</td>
<td>Standard I- Mission, Academic Quality, Institutional Effectiveness, Integrity Standard II- Student Learning Programs and Support Services Standard III- Resources Standard IV- Leadership and Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Set Standards</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set measures for student achievement (retention, persistence, successful course, degree, certificate completion, licensures, gainful employment)</td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements already fully achieved and self-sustained</td>
<td>Continued conformance confirmed 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The basis for all college plans.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College promotes access and student success through associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic workforce development, and basic skills instruction. Our educational programs and support services meet the needs of diverse communities as measured by campus institutional learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMP Strategic Educational Master Plan</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution set standards by which a college is measured.</td>
<td>Outlines 4 strategic goals and the specific objectives and measures for achieving them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Focus Essay</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the essentials of the self-evaluation.</td>
<td>Quality Focus-Completion. Action Projects- 1) Streamline planning processes, 2) Review educational and student support services, 3) Strengthen communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SharePoint</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data organization program.</td>
<td>Accessibly integrates all college documents and data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence College-wide dialogue</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>L.A. Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documented Proof</td>
<td>SEMP Factbook, ATD data, Equity data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous, systematic input from faculty, staff, students, and administrators.</td>
<td>Committee attendance and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 & 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)
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 college and/or 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

Standard IV.C.4
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 policy-making 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
IV.C.4-12 – BOT minutes, VKC and Farm, 10/15/11 and 4/29/15
IV.C.4-13 – Legislative and Public Affairs Committee, Board Legislative Priorities for 2015, 11/19/14
IV.C.4-14 – BOT agendas, Legislative advocacy, 2015
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 and 7600-7606); (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
Standard IV.C.6
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.
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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)

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.8-18 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
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
IV.C.8-17 – IESS Agenda and Underprepared Students PPT, 6/11/14
IV.C.8-18 – IESS agenda 1/29/14
IV.C.8-19 – IESS 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
IV.C.8-22 – 2014 Student Survey Question 25 and results
IV.C.8-23 – IESS minutes & Student Survey results PPT, 5/27/15
IV.C.8-24 – BOT agenda and PPT, 6/10/15
IV.C.8-25 – BOT minutes 3/28/13
IV.C.8-26 – IESS minutes 9/25/13
IV.C.8-27 – BOT agenda – TBD
Standard IV.C.9
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
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
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  
IV.C.11-2 – Board Rule 2300.10 – 2300.11  
IV.C.11-3 – Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2013  
IV.C.11-4 – Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2015  
IV.C.11-5 – Trustees Form 700  
IV.C.11-6 – BOT minutes 12/13/14
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

**Standard IV.C.13**
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 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)

f. 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)

g. 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)

h. 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)

i. 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.13-21 – 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
IV.D.1-10 – DBC Minutes, 7/15/15 and 8/13/14
IV.D.1-11 – Chancellor Budget Recommendations, 8/26/15
IV.D.1-12 – WLAC Interim President Press Release, 6/25/15
IV.D.1-14 – District/College Functional map, 2008
IV.D.1-16 – Committee Description template
IV.D.1-17 – College Governance and Functions Handbook template
IV.D.1-19 – ESC 2014 Program Reviews
IV.D.1-20 – Draft Functional Area maps 2015
IV.D.1-22 – SIS maps

**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 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)
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

IV.D.2-2 – District Functional Area maps, 2015
IV.D.2-3 – Functional Area map review request email, 7/24/15
IV.D.2-5 – DOSO evaluations 2008-2009
IV.D.2-6 – DOSO evaluations 2011-2012
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, 10/1/15
IV.D.2-10 – 2014 ESC Services Surveys
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

**Standard IV.D.4**

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.
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
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)

Analysis and Evaluation:

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
Standard IV.D.6

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 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*
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
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
Moving Forward
Quality Focus Essay

Los Angeles Harbor College undertook the current self-evaluation cycle with a renewed determination to examine the various college functions and processes through the context of quality and by answering the question, What is the college doing well and what areas need improvement? This examination is also supported by recognizing that community colleges as a whole confront new challenges from various constituent communities as well as new requirements from both the state and federal governments. While recognizing this changing landscape, participants in the 2016 Self-Evaluation Report also recognized Harbor’s sustained pattern of identifying goals and outcomes by the collection and analysis of data, and its use of the results to enhance student success. As these processes are further defined and refined in response to change, the overarching question becomes, How does the college define quality and how will it be measured?

After reviewing a variety of data from Achieving the Dream (Harbor College joined ATD in 2011 and became an ATD Leader College in 2014), the California Chancellor’s Office Scorecard, and Harbor’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the Academic Senate, the College Planning Council, and the Accreditation Steering Committee determined that the overarching goal of more effectively fulfilling the mission of the College and measuring the College’s ability to do so provided a compelling quality focus. Placing the mission front and center provides the framework for developing more specific action goals, and an accompanying focus on measurable data offers a quantitative and qualitative roadmap for improvement of student outcomes and success throughout the College. Sharpening the focus on the College mission merges College strategic goals with all other planning activities and uses data to thoroughly assess and measure College accomplishments.

As a result of the self-evaluation, the College members agreed upon basic principles that would guide the work of College: use of data to measure student success efforts; alignment of our planning processes with the goals of the District (Los Angeles Community College District) via the College’s Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP); more focused use of technology to evaluate and track efforts to achieve College goals; improved collaboration of efforts and resource sharing across campus; and improved communication throughout the College.

Three action projects identified through the Accreditation self-evaluation align with the principles described above and with specific accreditation standards:

- Infuse “systems” principles into the assessment and planning process
- Strengthen collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Formalize college wide communications

**Action Project 1:**

**Infuse “Systems” principles into the assessment and planning processes.**

1. **Description:** The College mission is implemented through the College’s Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) and the Institutional Learning Outcomes. An integrated planning process is therefore needed—one that can align College plans with the SEMP, track achievement outcomes and resource allocations, and clarify relationships between different activities and goals in a single plan and those found in College plans. This action project will modernize the College planning process by integrating “systems” principles into the current process and provides a more holistic approach; creates
stronger alignments between College plans, the SEMP, and the goals in the District Educational Master Plan; and enhances the use of data for College planning. The planning process will become user-friendly and thus encourage wider participation across the College units and committees. Professional development in assessment and planning, such as software training workshops and data review, will be offered to faculty and staff to introduce and encourage holistic planning. Recommendations regarding the planning process will be identified, implemented, and evaluated by the College Planning Council, the Academic Senate, and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

2. **Action project came out of an examination of effectiveness in providing student learning and achievement in the context of its mission:** Because the prior College planning process was paper-based, it was difficult to create an overall planning picture for the College and assure that plans from all areas were focused on the College mission, aligned with other plans across campus, were measurable, and were informed by data. By creating a more integrated, holistic planning process through the use of technology and systems thinking, the College will be able to more effectively and efficiently increase student learning outcomes because efforts will be focused and resource allocations will reflect planning.

3. **Data and analysis used for selecting this action project:** The Planning Evaluation Comprehensive Report 2012-13 (April 2014) summarized the College Planning Retreat held in February 2014. In that retreat, the College recognized that the planning processes, while improved, still proved cumbersome. The report included a survey, with “Simplify the process with less forms” and “consolidate” as repeated comments. Other outcomes of the retreat were the recognition that a more integrative process was needed, that it needed to align the College’s Educational Master Plan to the District Strategic Plan, that unit and area plans needed streamlining, and that the College Annual Plan overlapped with the Educational Master Plan. The revision of the planning process began in 2014 and has been greatly enhanced by the selection of a new software program in summer 2015 that aligns all components of the planning process. This action plan will focus the College on continuing the implementation of a more holistic, systems based process.

4. **Change, development, institutionalization, and/or expansion:** Prior planning processes at the College relied primarily on Word-based documents, making it difficult to readily see alignment with the College mission, to track outcomes, track resource requests and allocations, and to measure achievements. Participation in the planning was also lower than acceptable for the College because of the cumbersome processes in place. This action project will result in institutionalizing an improved planning process. The College transitioned to a new planning software with a pilot for assessment and program review completed in fall 2015.

5. **Implementation:** see LAHC Action Plans chart for specific details and the timeline.

6. **Significance over multi-year period:** In the next three years, the use of a systems based, integrated planning process will expand to include all planning actions; the College planning manual will be revised to incorporate the changes in the process; and a formalized and measurable planning cycle will be developed, evaluated, and revised. The College will be able to clearly see connections between planning and resource allocations, and to see student achievement at the course, program, and institution level, including progress on Scorecard data and institution-set standards. Full implementation of the integrated planning process will occur by the end of the three-year period.

7. **Anticipated outcomes/impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness:** Academic quality and student achievement will improve because College’s success efforts will be aligned with the College’s mission and goals in the Strategic Educational Master Plan.
systematic and data-driven. Institutional effectiveness will be enhanced as the planning model will incorporate data-driven planning and stronger ties created between planning and resource allocation.

8. **Outcomes are observable and measurable:** The outcomes of this action plan include the integration of college plans (e.g. Technology, Human Resources, Facilities, Student Equity, Student Success and Support Program) into the overall planning process; alignment of goals and outcomes in College plans with the Strategic Educational Master Plan; increased use of data for decision making; plans tracked across campus via individual SEMP goals and measures.

9. **Related to Accreditation Standards:** Several Standards referred to an improved planning system as a means of continuous quality improvement; specifically Standard I.B. 8-9, which discusses the importance of creating an understanding of strengths and weaknesses and IV.A.3, which discusses the need for clearly defined roles in institutional governance to

**Action Project 2:**

**Strengthen Collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services**

1. **Description:** This action project will provide tools to better coordinate the services and resources of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and College student success initiative efforts. Rubrics will be created to evaluate existing student success programs in relation to Academic Affairs and Student Services, with an analysis of points of connection and points of disconnection. Best practices will be identified as well as areas in which resources can be leveraged. Professional development, such as joint retreats, will be offered to faculty and staff in order to build more informed relationships between the two areas. Recommendations for improved collaboration will be identified, implemented, and evaluated by the Student Success Coordinating Committee.

2. **Action project came out of an examination of effectiveness in providing student learning and achievement in the context of its mission:** State mandates, such as Student Success and Support Programs, Equity, and AB288—Dual Enrollment, are requiring that Academic Affairs and Student Services areas at colleges work collaboratively in order to achieve student achievement measures of completion, persistence, and success. To meet those mandates, Harbor College created numerous student success initiatives, such as Harbor Advantage, a first-year experience program that provides students a guaranteed full-time schedule, faculty mentors, counseling, and student support; and CHAMPS—Challenging Athletes’ Minds for Personal Success—a program for Harbor Athletes’ that provides tutoring, mandatory success workshops, counseling, and student support. While these two programs (and others like them) are showing great promise in improving student outcomes on a variety of measures, to scale up such programs the College will need to strengthen collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services.

3. **Data and analysis used for selecting this action project:** Achieving the Dream data and data provided by Harbor’s Institutional Effectiveness Office has shown that collaborative programs are creating success for Harbor students. Harbor Advantage students persisted fall-to-spring (2014-2015) at a 14 percent higher rate than first-year students not in the program and had a six percent higher completion rate. In spring 2015, the first semester of the program, students in CHAMPS had a five percent higher completion rates than first-time students not in the program. By expanding these and other collaborative programs, and creating new ones, more students will have the opportunity to succeed.
4. **Change, development, institutionalization, and/or expansion.** To further increase overall student success, the College needs to increase the number of students participating in student success initiative programs and create new programs specific for disproportionally impacted students, as outlined in the Student Equity Plan. This increase in the number of students being served in success initiative programs can be accomplished by creating stronger ties between Academic Affairs and Student Services.

5. **Implementation:** see LAHC Action Plans chart for specific details and the timeline.

6. **Significance over multi-year period:** At the dean and vice-president level, Academic Affairs and Student Services work have a long history of working collaboratively. Indeed, the two vice presidents worked together for nearly 15 years prior to their retirements this year. Continuing this collaboration, and expanding it to all levels of the college, will enable the College to serve students and meet the mission of the College in a unified manner.

7. **Anticipated outcomes/impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness:** Improved communication and collaboration between Academic Affairs and students services will lead to more effective student success programs/initiatives at the College and therefore improved academic quality and student success. Institutional effectiveness will be improved as the two areas leverage resources in support of student success initiatives.

8. **Outcomes are observable and measurable:** Outcomes include an increase in committees that require Academic Affairs and Student Services faculty and staff participation and improved understanding between faculty, staff, and administrators in each area. The Achieving the Dream, Scorecard, Student Success and Support Program, and Equity data for Harbor College will demonstrate continued improvement year by year in the key measures, and the College will improve in meeting institution-set standards.

9. **Related to Accreditation Standards:** The standards call for collaborative efforts in meeting students’ needs; in particular, I.B.1 calls for collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, and academic quality, and Standard II.A.6 discusses scheduling to meet student needs. Collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services is essential in meeting these standards.

**Action Project 3:**

**Formalize college wide communications**

1. **Description:** This action project will improve communications throughout the College by evaluating existing communications across campus and providing strategies, processes, and standards for College committees, units, and areas. This analysis will include a review of committees at the College—charges, memberships, and manuals—to ensure proper alignments exist within the committee and with other College committees. It will also include a review of internal and external modes of communication. Professional development to improve overall communications, such as committee best practices and website access (for posting information) will be offered to faculty and staff. Recommendations regarding improved communications will be identified, implemented, and evaluated by the College Planning Council, the Academic Senate, and the Assessment Committee.

2. **Action project came out of an examination of effectiveness in providing student learning and achievement in the context of its mission:** As the College members prepared the 2015 Mid Term...
Report, and started work on the 2016 Self Evaluation Report, it was evident that communications regarding College activities could be improved as communications related issues arose in many standards. Work started on a revision of the College website when a full-time web designer was hired in April 2014. As the College began website improvements, other communication lapses were noted, such as Committee minutes not being posted to the website.

3. **Data and analysis used for selecting this action project:** Two surveys—Achieving the Dream 2014 Reflections survey and the College’s 2015 Campus Climate survey—both indicated that College faculty, staff, and administrators believed campus communications could be improved. In addition, a student survey conducted in fall 2015 provided information regarding website usage that demonstrated improvements were needed for ease of access. These information sources affirmed the idea that communications across campus needed to be improved.

4. **Change, development, institutionalization, and/or expansion:** Harbor College is considered a small-to-medium sized college, and therefore past communications were often conducted on a more informal basis. However, new state mandates, new accreditation requirements, and institution-set standards, among other measures, require a more systematic means of communication in order for the College to more effectively meet its mission and improve student achievement. An evaluation of communications in order to determine where communication gaps exist and set in place improvement plans will move the College forward in institutionalizing standards for college wide communications.

5. **Implementation:** see LAHC Action Plans chart for specific details and the timeline.

6. **Significance over multi-year period:** In the next three years, improved communication systems will increase the information available to the campus and community. The foundation of the systems will include standardization of committee reporting, alignment of committee work, an updated website, and creation of a social media plan. This improved communication campus wide will increase participation of campus members in the committees, initiatives, and activities of the College, which will lead to improved programs and services for students.

7. **Anticipated outcomes/impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness:** Improved campus wide communications and greater access and ease of use of information will create a campus climate for effectiveness in the instructional programs and student services offered by the College.

8. **Outcomes are observable and measurable:** Improvement in communications can be measured yearly via the Achieving the Dream Reflections survey and the yearly College Campus Climate survey.

9. **Related to Accreditation Standards:** This action project addresses several standards, but in particular Standard I.B.7 asks that institutions regularly evaluates policies and practices across all areas of the institution, which requires strong communication throughout the campus.

**Commitment to Excellence**

The three action projects are directed toward growing and maturing existing college systems and processes to more clearly identify student needs and develop strategies for success. Improvements in systems planning, collaboration between Academic Affairs and Students Services, and strengthening campus wide communication tools enable the College to better articulate and work toward College improvement and student achievement.
### Los Angeles Harbor College Action Projects

#### Action Project 1:
**Infuse “Systems” principles into the assessment and planning processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Goals / Outcomes</th>
<th>Modernized College planning process by integrating systems thinking principles into the current processes; providing stronger alignments between College plans, the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP), and the goals in the District Educational Master Plan; and enhancing the use of data for College planning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actions / Steps to be Implemented | • Stronger incorporation of technology into planning  
  • Training sessions for assessment and program review completion  
  • Update planning manual  
  • Evaluation |
| Timeline | Year 1: 2015-2016  
  • Complete transfer of assessment, planning, and other pertinent data to SharePoint  
  • Receive approval of new “Systems” infused planning process by Assessment Committee, College Planning Council, and Academic Senate  
  • Conduct training sessions for pilot program for unit planning and program review  
  • Update planning manual to incorporate changes in the planning process  
  • Provide professional development to faculty and staff to introduce the new planning process and software  
  • College wide implementation of new process for unit planning and program review  
  
  Year 2: 2016-2017  
  • Evaluate updated planning process  
  • Determine actions to be taken based on the evaluation  
  • Continue planning cycle as new actions are implemented  
  • Increase participation of units, areas, programs in the new process  
  
  Year 3: 2017-2018  
  • Fully implement redesigned process with changes  
  • Evaluate for effectiveness of planning process  
  • Adjust and/or address areas in need of improvement (as appropriate) |
| Responsible Parties | College Planning Council, Academic Senate, Office of Institutional Effectiveness |
| Resources | Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Vice Presidents and Deans of Academic Affairs and Student Services |
| Assessment | An evaluative component is scheduled into the timeline for this project. |

#### Action Project 2:
**Strengthen Collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services**

| Desired Goals / Outcomes | Improved coordination of the services and resources of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and College student success initiative efforts. |
| Actions / Steps to be Implemented | • Evaluate existing collaboration efforts between SS and AA.  
• Make recommendations to strengthen collaboration  
• Professional development for faculty and staff of SS and AA |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Year 1: 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Creation of SharePoint rubric by the Student Success Coordinating Committee (SSCC) for evaluation of existing Student Services (SS) programs and Academic Affairs (AA) programs (both state mandated and campus initiatives)  
• Completion of evaluation rubric by SS and AA programs  
• Evaluation of rubric and data by the SSCC  
• Recommendations for strengthening the relationship between AA and SS made by the SSCC to the Academic Senate and the College Planning Council  
• Creation of best practices for improved connections between SS and AA, based on the recommendations, at a campus wide student success retreat  
• Review committee memberships to ensure SS and AA participation is included  
• Survey faculty and staff to determine understanding of SS and AA functions and services (pre-survey) |
| | Year 2: 2016-2017 |  
• Implement best practices identified at the retreat held in year 1  
• Evaluate effectiveness of restructured committees (as appropriate)  
• Survey faculty and staff to determine understanding of SS and AA functions and services (post-survey) |
| | Year 3: 2017-2018 |  
• Evaluate improved SS and AA collaboration via success measures for collaborative programs and overall student success (institution-set standards, Achieving the Dream data)  
• Adjust and/or address areas in need of improvement (as appropriate) |
| Responsible Parties | Student Success Coordinating Committee |
| Resources | Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Vice Presidents and Deans of Academic Affairs and Student Services |
| Assessment | An evaluative component is scheduled into the timeline for this project. |

**Action Project 3:**  
**Formalize college wide communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Goals / Outcomes</th>
<th>Improved communications throughout the College by evaluating existing communications across campus and providing strategies, processes, and standards of communication for College committees, units, and areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actions / Steps to be Implemented | • Evaluate communications in order to determine communication gaps and set in place improvement plans to move the College forward in institutionalizing standards for college wide communications  
• Provide faculty and staff professional development, such as best practices for communicating across campus and website access (for posting information) |
Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process

In response to the self-evaluation, the College determined that improvements made in three areas will increase institutional effectiveness, including:

- Infuse “systems” principles into the assessment and planning process
- Strengthen collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Formalize college wide communications

Specific planned actions derived from the Standards include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.B.1</td>
<td>Strengthen collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.7</td>
<td>Formalize college wide communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.8-9</td>
<td>Infuse “systems” principles into the assessment and planning process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluative component is scheduled into the timeline for this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.C.5</th>
<th>College will conduct a review of its institutional policy manuals, procedures, and publications. After a comprehensive review, the College will then designate responsibility to an existing committee/committees to sustain the formal review process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| III.A.6 | Improve communication regarding learning outcomes  
Strengthen collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services |
| III.A.7 | As funding becomes available, hire positions as prioritized |
| III.A.9 | Increase both faculty and staffing levels whenever required by minimum FTE and as budget becomes available |
| III.B.3 | Improve integration of facilities planning into institutional planning |
| III.C.4 | Create widespread training and support for use of technology by faculty, staff, and administrators |
| IV.A.II | Infuse “systems” principles into the assessment and planning process |
Appendix A. Standard Committee Membership

### Standard Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Responsible Committee (Click for Membership)</th>
<th>Standard Chair</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Ellen Joiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard I.A</td>
<td>College Planning Council</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Joanna Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard I.B</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, William Hernandez</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Priscilla Lopez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard I.C</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, William Hernandez</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Priscilla Lopez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard I.A</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Jim Stanbery</td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston, Sandra Sanchez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II.A</td>
<td>Standard II.B Team</td>
<td>Jonathan Lee</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II.C</td>
<td>Student Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton, Elizabeth Colocho</td>
<td>Mercy Yanez, Corey Rodgers</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.A</td>
<td>Human Resources Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Andrew Sanchez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.B</td>
<td>Work Environment Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>Andrew Sanchez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Joan Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.C</td>
<td>Technology Advisory Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Ivan Clark, Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III.D</td>
<td>Budget Committee; and Administrative Services Cluster Committee</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa, Nabeel Barakat</td>
<td>Sandra Sanchez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Joanna Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.A</td>
<td>College Planning Council</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos, Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Jim Stanbery, Joanna Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.B</td>
<td>President’s Cabinet</td>
<td>Otto Lee</td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Ellen Joiner, Rhea Estoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV.C</td>
<td>LACCD</td>
<td>LACCD</td>
<td>LACCD</td>
<td>LACCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College Planning Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing (or Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
<td>Otto Lee</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
<td>Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Sanchez</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Carrillo</td>
<td>Acting Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Ivan Clarke</td>
<td>Director, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette McClenney</td>
<td>SEIU 721 (Supervisors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jared Fowler</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakshman De Silva</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art Ruelas</td>
<td>Building &amp; Construction Trades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Diaz</td>
<td>SEIU 99 (Education Workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Juan Baez</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mona Dallas Reddick</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Senate Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing or Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
<td>Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Hernandez</td>
<td>Academic Senate Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Hale Savard</td>
<td>Communications Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Amano-Tompkins</td>
<td>Communications Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenny Arzaga</td>
<td>Health Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce Saxton</td>
<td>Health Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Baez</td>
<td>Humanities and Fine Arts Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farah Saddigh</td>
<td>Mathematics and Technology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tigran Alikhanyan</td>
<td>Mathematics and Technology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nabeel Barakat</td>
<td>Kinesiology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Joiner</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Kato</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Affairs Cluster Committee Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing or Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Stanbery</td>
<td>Faculty, Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Sanchez</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Carrillo</td>
<td>Acting Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Nola Timms</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vania Yalamova</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>As appointed by ASO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As appointed by ASO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chair</td>
<td>Stan Sandell</td>
<td>Business Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Warren</td>
<td>Communications Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynn Yamakawa</td>
<td>Health Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Baez</td>
<td>Humanities/Fine Arts Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nabeel Barakat</td>
<td>Kinesiology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Joy Fisher</td>
<td>Counseling Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Grady</td>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathon Lee</td>
<td>Library Science Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farah Saddigh</td>
<td>Mathematics and Technology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce Parker</td>
<td>Science, Family &amp; Consumer Studies Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio /</td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
<td>Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Edward Pai</td>
<td>Dean, Institutional Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Group Representing (or Title)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Jonathan Lee</td>
<td>Library Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Robyn Lamoreux</td>
<td>Library Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megan Lange</td>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Paul Grady</td>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Reigadas</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mario Valadez</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing (or Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Corey Rodgers</td>
<td>Dean, Enrollment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Colocho</td>
<td>Faculty, Counseling Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Dean, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston</td>
<td>Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Joy Fisher</td>
<td>Chair, Counseling Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Steele</td>
<td>Faculty, Special Programs &amp; Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delores Hudson</td>
<td>Faculty, Communications Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hale Savard</td>
<td>Faculty, Communications Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Cristian Contreras</td>
<td>Assessment Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Henderson</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy-Loewy Wellisch</td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Mariner</td>
<td>E.O.P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Leo Yang</td>
<td>ASO, Vice President of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mia Padilla</td>
<td>ASO Senator/ EFC Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Rhea Estoya</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing (or Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Sandra Sanchez</td>
<td>Dean, Economic and Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Sanchez</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corey Rodgers</td>
<td>Dean, Enrollment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Bill Englert</td>
<td>Director of College Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Davis</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette McClenny</td>
<td>SEIU 721 (Supervisors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Diaz</td>
<td>SEIU 99 (Education Workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art Ruelas</td>
<td>Building &amp; Construction Trades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Paul Grady</td>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Joiner</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Science Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nabeel Barakat</td>
<td>Kinesiology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Baez</td>
<td>Humanities and Fine Arts Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing (or Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nabeel Barakat</td>
<td>Chair, Kinesiology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Dean, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Agopian</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
<td>Academic Senate, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Fradkin</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Tim Davis</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitute</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Group Representing (or Title)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>Chair, Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston</td>
<td>Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corey Rodgers</td>
<td>Dean, Enrollment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
<td>President, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Reid</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Loiterman</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Krueger</td>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Carter</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division / PACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Linden</td>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Terriah Stroman</td>
<td>ASO Senator Pro Tempore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexa Victoriano</td>
<td>ASO Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Carlos Diaz</td>
<td>SEIU 99 (Education Workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette McLenney</td>
<td>SEIU 721 (Supervisors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yvette Parra</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Roberts</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Bill Englert</td>
<td>Facilities Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>N. Guskos</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constitute</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing (or Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Stephanie Atkinson-Alston</td>
<td>Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivan Clarke</td>
<td>Director, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Michael Song</td>
<td>Humanities and Fine Arts Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula Brown</td>
<td>Teaching Learning Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Davis</td>
<td>Business Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lara Lane</td>
<td>Math and Technology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Thomas Spiegel</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Science Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Son Nguyen</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Science Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constitute</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Representing (or Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nabeel Barakat</td>
<td>Chair, Kinesiology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Otto Lee</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Dean, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
<td>Academic Senate (President)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Fradkin</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Agopian</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Arif Ahmed</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Group Representing (or Title)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Otto Lee</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Bob Suppelsa</td>
<td>Vice President, Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phyllis Braxton</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bobbi Villalobos</td>
<td>Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Yanez</td>
<td>Dean, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Tim Davis</td>
<td>AFT 1521A (Staff Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Diaz</td>
<td>SEIU 99 (Education Workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mona Dallas Reddick</td>
<td>AFT 1521 (Faculty Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
<td>Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Gabriel Cabrera</td>
<td>ASO President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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