

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

**Los Angeles City College
855 N. Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90029**

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

**This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team
that visited Los Angeles City College March 6 – 10, 2016**

**Anthony E. Beebe, Ed.D.
Chair**

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

DATE: July 8, 2016

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles City College
855 North Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90029

TEAM REPORT: Comprehensive Evaluation Report

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited Los Angeles City College March 7 – March 10, 2016.

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

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

1. The Commission notes that references to a business continuity and/or disaster recovery plan should not be capitalized as in District Recommendation 4. The team’s reference is to a general plan and not a specific plan with that title.

External Evaluation Visit Team Roster

**Los Angeles City College
Sunday, March 6 - Thursday, March 10, 2016**

Roster of College Team Members

Dr. Anthony E. Beebe (College Team Chair) President San Diego City College	Dr. Renee Kilmer (College Team Assistant) Interim Vice President of Instruction San Diego City College
Dr. Greg Gillespie President Ventura College	Mr. James Matthews Professor, Librarian Chabot College
Dr. Albert Alt Vice President, Administrative Services Modesto Junior College	Dr. Tammi Marshall Professor/Chair, Mathematics Cuyamaca College
Dr. Wendell Stephenson Professor, Philosophy Fresno City College	Dr. Celia Cruz-Johnson Professor, Basic Skills San Jose City College
Mr. Anthony DiSalvo Dean, Language Arts Chaffey College	Dr. Kevin Horan Vice President, Instruction & Student Services Los Medanos College
Mr. Raj Bajaj Dean, Educational Services Riverside Community College District	

Roster of District Team Members

Dr. Helen Benjamin (District Team Chair) Chancellor Contra Costa Community College District	Ms. Tammeil Y. Gilkerson (District Team Assistant) Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs Contra Costa College
Ms. Linda Beam Vice President Human Resources El Camino College	Ms. Deborah Ludford District Director of Information Services North Orange County Community College District
Dr. Jannett Jackson Chancellor Chabot-Las Positas Community College Dist.	Dr. Jamey Nye Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction Los Rios Community College District

Mr. Dustin Johnson
Trustee
Los Rios Community College District

Dr. Lynn Neault
Vice Chancellor Student Services
San Diego Community College District Office

Mr. Doug Horner
Director of Facilities and Bond Program
Chabot-Las Positas CCD

Mr. Fred Williams
Interim Chancellor
North Orange County Community College District

Mr. Christopher Tarman
Senior Dean of Research, Planning,
and Institutional Effectiveness
Grossmont Cuyamaca Community College District

Summary of the External Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles City College

DATES OF VISIT: March 6 – 10, 2016

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Anthony E. Beebe

College Evaluation

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Los Angeles City College (LACC) March 6 – 10, 2016, for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and United States Department of Education regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and improvement, and submitting a recommendation to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on Wednesday, December 2, 2015, and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on Tuesday, January 19, 2016. During this visit, the chair met with LACC President René D. Martinez, as well as other key College leadership involved in the self-evaluation preparation process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on Tuesday, January 26, 2016.

The evaluation team received the College's self-evaluation document and related evidence 60 days prior to the site visit. The information was comprehensive, well written, and nicely organized, detailing how the college meets the Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, Commission Policies, and United States Department of Education regulations. The College Accreditation Liaison Officer was responsive to team questions and concerns. The team confirmed that representatives of the College community, including faculty, staff, students, and administration participated in the self-evaluation report development. The team also found that the College provided a very thoughtful self-evaluation, containing several self-identified action plans and a Quality Focus Essay for institutional improvement.

On Sunday afternoon, March 6, 2016, the chair and team leads from Standards III and IV visited the District office for an overview of District operations and welcoming remarks from Chancellor Francisco C. Rodriguez. On Monday morning, March 7, 2016, the chair and team leads from Standards I, III, and IV visited the District office for more specific evidence evaluation related to District/College operations. Following the District office visit, the entire team convened at the College, where it was introduced to the College community at a team reception.

During the evaluation visit, team members conducted more than 75 formal meetings, interviews, and observations involving College employees, students, and board members. There were numerous less formal interactions with students and employees outside of

officially scheduled interviews, and there were also informal observations of both online and face-to-face classes. Group interviews were held with the President, Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services, Vice President of Administration, and the President of the Academic Senate. An open forum provided the community and members of LACC an opportunity to meet with members of the evaluation team and discuss accreditation-related matters.

The team reviewed numerous materials supporting the self-evaluation report in the team room and electronically, which included documents and evidence supporting the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and United States Department of Education regulations. Evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, the College catalog and schedule and documents such as institutional plans, program review procedures and reports, student learning outcome evidence, distance education classes, College policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and College governance structure. The team also reviewed evidence and documentation stored on a flash drive and several binders provided by the College.

The team greatly appreciated the cooperation and full access to the College from employees throughout the visit. The team valued the assistance of the Accreditation Liaison Officer and other key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. Campus staff members met every request.

The team found a number of extraordinary and effective programs, practices, and approaches, warranting a number of commendations. The team found the College satisfies the vast majority of the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and United States Department of Education regulations, but issued some recommendations related to improvement and compliance with the Standards

District Evaluation

Concurrent with the College Team evaluation of Los Angeles City College, a District Team evaluation was conducted of District operations. The District Team and the College Team reports are united herein, providing a comprehensive accreditation evaluation of Los Angeles City College. The responsibility of the District Team was to facilitate a single comprehensive examination of the quality of District services and the degree to which they support institutional abilities to meet or exceed Accreditation Standards, and to avoid multiple and conflicting messages about the efficacy of District administrative and other functions. The District Team worked in coordination with the College teams to complete the comprehensive evaluation for the District and its nine colleges. The District Team examined District operations in light of the Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements (ERs), and policies and developed responses in this document to be included in all reports. In addition, the District Team coordinated the review of District functions and the writing of commendations and recommendations to meet Accreditation Standards for improvement and compliance. The District Team took either a “lead” or “support” role, as indicated below, in responding to ERs and Standards.

District Team Lead Responsibilities

ER or Standard	Brief Description	Responsibility
ER 5	Financial accountability	
I.C.7	Policies on academic freedom	
I.C.8	Policies that promote honesty, academic integrity	
II.C.6	Admissions policies	As to District admissions
II.C.8	Student records	As to District policy and practice
III.A.1-6, 8, 11-13, 15	Human resources	As to policies and District procedures
III.B.1-4	Physical resources	As to District planning, bond oversight, total cost of ownership formulas, etc.
III.C. 1-5	Technology resources	As to District planning, policy, practice
III.D.1-16	Financial resources	As to District planning, systems, policies, practices
IV.A.3-5	Governance	As to policies and District procedures
IV.C.1-13	Governing Board	
IV.D.1-7	Multi-college districts	

District Team Support Responsibilities

ER or Standard	Brief Description	Responsibility
ER 4	Chief executive officer	As to appointment of CEO by governing board.
I.A. 4	Mission approved, articulated and reviewed	As to approval of the mission statement by the Governing Board.
I.B.9	Planning addresses resource needs	As to District tie-in on integrated planning
I.C.12	Integrity with ACCJC	As to District Office
I.C.13	Integrity with external agencies, legal compliance	As to District Office
I.C.14	Commitment to quality paramount over supporting external interests	As to District Office, governing board
II.A.4	Course outlines of record have SLOs	As to District Office involvement in curriculum approval
II.A.10	Transfer policies, articulation agreements	As to District transfer policies and articulation

ER or Standard	Brief Description	Responsibility
II.B.4	Library and learning resources	As to District role, especially databases, contracted services, technology, resource allocations
II.C.7	Placement exams	As to District approval of exams
IV.A.1	Innovation	As to District Office, possibly policy

Major Findings and Recommendations of the March 2016 External Evaluation Team

District Commendations

District Commendation 1: The team commends the District for exemplary preparation and coordination of the accreditation visit for all nine colleges under the new accreditation standards. (Standard I.C.12).

District Commendation 2: The team commends the District for its commitment to professional development and improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of its employees in support of student achievement. (Standard III.A.14).

District Commendation 3: The team commends the technology staff from the nine colleges and the District for their teamwork and collaboration in the areas of shared staff resources, development of standards, collaborative training opportunities and deployment of integrated systems resulting in effective and efficient use of technology resources to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.4).

District Commendation 4: The team commends the District for its substantial support of the internal audit function. (Standard III.D.8).

District Commendation 5: The team commends the District for its commitment to continuous quality improvement by building evaluation loops for all its services, decision-making processes, and institutional performance. (Standards IV.D.2, IV.D.5, IV.D.7).

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure consistent and uniform guidelines for the search and selection of adjunct faculty. (Standard III.A.1).

District Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure all personnel are systematically evaluated at stated intervals in accordance with the bargaining agreements and Board policies. (Standard III.A.5).

District Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District update the performance evaluations of academic administrators to include the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. (Standard III.A.6).

District Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District and colleges develop a comprehensive business continuity/disaster recovery plan to ensure reliable access, safety, and security. (Standard III.C.3).

District Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness and better assess financial resource availability, the team recommends that the District implement a District position control system to track and budget for personnel costs. (Standard III.D.4).

District Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District comprehensively responds to the recurring audit findings concerning: 1) the internal control weakness in information technology controls over the areas of security and change management; and 2) the state compliance exceptions related to “To Be Arranged” (TBA) hours attendance documentation and course classifications. (Standard III.D.7).

District Recommendation 7 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District develop and publicize a plan to fully fund the Other Post Employment Benefit (OPEB) Liability, which is currently funded at 16.06 percent. (Standard III.D.12)

District Recommendation 8 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District develop a process to capture the full impact of the District’s liability for load banking and to record the liability in the District’s financial statements. (Standard III.D.12)

District Recommendation 9 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District review the membership of institutional governance committees to ensure all employee groups, particularly classified staff, have formal input on institutional plans, policies, and other key considerations as appropriate. (Standard IV.A.5).

District Recommendation 10 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board adopt policies that clearly define the process for the selection and evaluation of the chancellor. (Standard IV.C.3).

District Recommendation 11 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board establish a formal process for approving the review of policies in which no revisions are made and to regularly assess the effectiveness of all policies in fulfilling the District mission. (Standard IV.C.7).

District Recommendation 12 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expand efforts to communicate decisions made in the institutional governance process to all stakeholders. (Standard IV.D.6).

Los Angeles City College Commendations

College Commendation 1: The team acknowledges a high level of passion and commitment to student success and sense of community throughout the institution.

College Commendation 2: The College has developed and implemented an effective Integrated Planning and Governance process, which is set forth in the related Handbook. The model was developed internally with input from all constituencies. The model is understood and followed by constituencies and integrates unit plans, program reviews, and resource allocation to support the Educational and Strategic Master Plan of the College.

College Commendation 3: The College through the efforts of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has developed operational data reports to facilitate decision making. Instructional Departments are working with administration to optimize course offerings and increase productivity. The College Student Services areas analyze assessment data to improve success, retention, and completion and make changes to enhance student learning and provide services.

College Commendation 4: The College has developed “The LACC Guardian Scholars Program (GSP).” This program serves students who are current, former, or emancipated foster youth, pursuing a path within higher education. GSP’s mission is to support the well-being of students on their educational journeys to earning a Career Technical Certificate or Associate Degree or transferring to a university.

College Commendation 5: There is a strong partnership between the LACC Foundation and the College resulting in significant scholarship opportunities and support for students.

College Commendation 6: LACC has effectively implemented a Veterans Resource Center that enables college success among student veterans. The program includes the Veteran's Tools for Success (VSOC). The VSOC places experienced vocational rehabilitation counselors on college campuses to assist veterans.

College Commendation 7: LACC has an award winning college newspaper, *The Collegian*, that has been in operation since 1929. *The Collegian* has won multiple awards including the coveted “General Excellence Award” from the Journalism Association of Community Colleges.

Los Angeles City College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College expand its current Distance Education Plan to include a section relating to Distance Education Pedagogy, incorporating related sections from ACCJC’s Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education. The College should then implement the components of this plan, proceeding with an ongoing, systematic, quality assessment process for all online courses. This expanded plan for distance education, based on ACCJC’s Guide, should outline all necessary practices the College would need to implement in order to meet standards, providing a road map for the College to come into

compliance. The team further recommends that the college comply with 34 C.F.R. § 602.3 (as referenced in the ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education) to ensure that regular, substantive, and effective interaction is provided in Distance Education courses. (Standards I.B.9, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.5, II.A.7, II.A.12).

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College broadly communicate the results of all its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and appropriate priorities, posting all committee meeting agendas, minutes, documents, and reports to the website and conspicuous areas. Campus climate and other survey results should be summarized, shared, and discussed with students, faculty, staff, and administration, including documentation of the discussion and resulting actions. (Standards I.B.8, IV.A.6, IV.A.7, IV.B.6).

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College organize its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement by reviewing course and program level alignment of student learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.2, I.C.4, II.A.3).

College Recommendation 4 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develops and implements an Enrollment Management Plan, ensuring financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. (Standards I.B.9, I.C.1, III.D.1, III.D.2).

College Recommendation 5 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College ensure that for every class section offered students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes matching the institution's officially approved course outline of record. (Standard II.A.3).

College Recommendation 6 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends a full review of the Final Budget Allocation Mechanism as documented in the District's annual adopted budget, specifically, reviewing the Parameters for College Debt Repayment policy and its impact to the College's ability to meet continuously its mission and sustain its fiscal viability. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3).

Introduction

Los Angeles City College (LACC) is a large, well-established urban community college located in the heart of Los Angeles. The campus sits on 49 acres and covers a service area that includes the majority of Central Los Angeles, Hollywood, and surrounding areas. The primary service area is defined by a region comprised of 20 zip codes, with 40% of the students coming from a five-mile area representing 10 zip codes.

Originally established in 1929, LACC has deep roots in the community. The College's initial charter was part of the Los Angeles Secondary School District. In 1931, the Los Angeles voters approved establishment of the Los Angeles Junior College District. That same year, the Board of Education changed the College's name to Los Angeles City College. Today, LACC is part of the nine-campus community college system of the Los Angeles Community College District.

Los Angeles City College serves approximately 21,600 students (unduplicated) each semester, equating to about 13,500 full-time equivalent students (FTES) annually. The College serves its students through an offering of 866 courses, 65 programs, and 76 certificates from its only campus site at 855 N. Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California. Additionally, the College has received approval from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges for a Distance Education Substantive Change proposal for 29 degree and 12 certificates programs to be offered, where 50 percent or more of the courses may be completed via online instruction.

LACC offers a broad range of educational programs in traditional academic subjects for associate degrees, transfer preparation, workforce training, career technical education, health occupations, and basic skills. As of fall 2015, the College has 53 active AA degree programs, with all but one (Radiologic Technology AS Degree) being two years in length. LACC also offers programs with specialized accreditation or licensure such as Registered Nursing, Dental Technology, Radiologic Technology, Dietetics, and Paralegal.

LACC is a diverse college. In fall 2014, 60 percent of students were female, 50 percent were Hispanic, 45 percent were under the age of 24, and 23 percent were over the age of 40. While the gender and age distribution of the student population has remained stable, during the last five years there has been a noticeable change in the College's race and ethnicity composition. From 2010-14, the proportion of Hispanic students increased from 44 to 50 percent while the percent of Asians, African Americans, and white students has declined.

Los Angeles City College accreditation was last reaffirmed in 2009.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that Los Angeles City College (LACC) is authorized to operate as a post-secondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation since 1952 by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education with authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act 2008.

The College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that LACC is operational and provides educational services to 21,600 (Fall 2014) unduplicated headcount, representing 84% credit and 16% noncredit students. Of these students, 70% were less than full-time (i.e., enrolled in less than 12 units). Sixty-three percent of students continue from one semester to the next. The College data indicate that student unit load has not changed over the last five years.

The College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

3. Degrees

Currently, the College has 65 active associate programs and all but one (Radiologic Technology AS Degree) are two academic years in length. The team confirmed that 92 percent of approved credit courses lead to degrees.

The College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The District's current chief executive officer is highly qualified for the position and has served as chancellor since June 1, 2014. His full-time responsibility is to the District. He possesses the requisite skills and authority to provide leadership for the District.

The evaluation team confirmed that the Governing Board employs President René D. Martinez as the chief executive officer (CEO) of Los Angeles City College. President Martinez has served LACC since 2012. The CEO does not serve as a member of the board nor as the board president. The Governing Board vests requisite authority in the President to administer board policies.

The College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

5. Financial Accountability

The District Office Accounting Office staff oversees District wide audits and is responsible for coordination of all site visits. The District also has a Central Financial Aid Unit that monitors and helps control the Perkins Loan default rates. The District has Perkins Loans outstanding (over 240 days in default) totaling \$1.8 million. When compared to total loans outstanding for the District of \$270 million, the default rate is approximately one percent of

their outstanding principal. District staff continue to make collection calls to help reduce the default rates throughout the District. Discussion with staff revealed that the District is phasing out the Perkins Loan Program.

The Central Financial Aid Unit recently had a Perkins Loan Program site visit for Los Angeles Trade-Technical College by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) to follow up on high default rates over the last three years. The final report has not been received, but at the exit interview, it was noted that while the rates were high, the USDE auditors were pleased with the collection efforts. Other compliance issues existed, but none related to the default rate.

The District annually undergoes an external financial audit by a Certified Public Accountant (CPA), which is made available to the public. Evidence shows that the audits were completed and are available to review on the District's website. Reports were available for the years ending June 30, 2001 through 2015.

Four colleges had a Perkins Loan default rate exceeding 30 percent for three straight years: West Los Angeles, Los Angeles Harbor, Los Angeles Pierce, and Los Angeles Trade-Technical. The total principal outstanding on loans in default exceeding 240 days for those four colleges (as of February 12, 2015) was \$874,202. The District is phasing out of the Perkins Loan Program and is moving to the Direct Loan Program. The published default rates for the Direct Loan Program are only available through fiscal year 2012. Of the nine colleges, only one (Los Angeles Trade-Technical College) had a rate over 30 percent and had only been in the program for one year.

The College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

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

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

Narrative:

LACC posted information on its college website the information regarding the Evaluation Team Visit and the process for third party comment, including access to the Third Party Comment Form, linking directly to the ACCJC web site. The team found no third party comment related to this visit.

<http://effectiveness.lacitycollege.edu/cc/accreditation/default.aspx>

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

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

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

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

Narrative:

The College has provided evidence in its self-study that it has established institution-set standards for course completion, job placement rates for instructional programs, and licensure passage rates for instructional programs.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

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

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

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

Narrative: Course credit calculations are described in the Curriculum Handbook and accompanying calculation sheet. A student enrolled full-time can complete degree requirements within two years.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

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

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

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

Narrative:

The process for submitting transcripts to be evaluated for LACC credit is described on the Admissions and Records web page and in the College Catalog. In order to be awarded credit for College work completed at another institution, students must submit official transcripts showing successful completion of lower-division courses at an accredited institution. The transcript review process includes evaluation of the course description or/and syllabus from the originating institution.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

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

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

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

Narrative:

The institution should develop processes, policies, and procedures ensuring that there is regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and that online activities are included as part of a student's grade. The institution should develop clear procedures for the systematic review of distance education courses based on student success rates and outcomes assessment. The College should also review the support services available to online students to ensure parity with students enrolled in face-to-face courses. (Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38. and the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.)

The College does not meet this regulation.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

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

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

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

Narrative:

The institution has clear procedures for student complaints and has a systematic process for using this feedback for continuous improvement. The procedures are outlined in the College catalog, online, and in publications within the Student Services division. Complaints are logged and maintained within the Student Services division and shared appropriately with concerned parties.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

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

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

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

Narrative:

Information about programs, locations, and policies is communicated to students and the public via the LACC College Catalog, the Schedule of Classes, and the College website. The College has an extensive website that discloses information about research and data gathering, planning, and the status on accreditation, including annual reports.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

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

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

Conclusion Check-Off:

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

Narrative:

The College default rates are within acceptable range – under 30%. The College has taken proactive measures to contain and reduce the default rate by educating and counseling borrowers. The Financial Aid Department also regularly monitors the rate.

STANDARD I

MISSION, ACADEMIC QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEGRITY

Standard I.A. - Mission

General Observations:

Los Angeles City College (LACC) has a clearly defined mission statement that is focused on student learning and achievement. The board approved mission statement – *“Los Angeles City College empowers students from the diverse communities it serves to achieve their educational and career goals by providing learner-centered pathways to success through transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills programs”* – coupled with the vision statement attest to LACC’s commitment to serving students. The College has identified processes for utilizing data to measure its effectiveness in accomplishing its mission as evidenced in its Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP). The establishment of programs and services is based on the ESMP and the College engages in a comprehensive, college-wide program review to plan and allocate resources towards future needs. LACC’s mission statement is widely disseminated and appears on College publications (e.g., catalogs, schedules, committee agendas, business cards, etc.) and is prominent throughout its website. The mission statement was most recently revised and approved in June 2014.

Findings and Evidence:

LACC has described and demonstrated its commitment to providing a wide range of educational degree programs, including transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills. The College utilizes and assesses data to determine the needs of its diverse constituency, which is clearly documented in the evidence provided. The development of Associate Degree Transfer (ADTs) is ongoing and currently stands at 14. LACC plans to revise its mission statement, including the Distance Education mission statement, to make more specific reference to the degree and credential programs it currently offers. During an interview with the Vice President of Student Services, it was suggested that inclusion of student support might be considered for upcoming mission statement revisions, given the wide array of student services offered at LACC. (Standard I.A.1, ER 6).

The College uses the following data in accomplishing its stated mission: College profiles, student access and achievement data, analysis of previous planning outcomes, and internal/external scans. In addition, LACC states that it uses student learning and service unit outcome assessment data, which has been disaggregated. (Standard I.A.2).

The establishment of programs and services stems from the College’s ESMP, which functions as the operational part of the mission. The ESMP also includes an ongoing program and service review process, which the team found to be comprehensive and effective. Evidence provided for the ESMP is clear and a sample program review is included

for the Art and Architecture Department. Requests for resources are discussed and then prioritized based on how they support student access and success. LACC has good ongoing integrated planning processes that support the College's mission. (Standard I.A.3).

The District's mission statement contains all the required elements and was most recently approved by the LACCD Board of Trustees on February 6, 2013.

In the self-evaluation, LACC states that it broadly disseminates its mission statement in many college publications and materials as evidenced by their catalog, schedule of classes, and websites. In addition, the college states that the mission appears on memoranda, agendas, and business cards. The team confirmed the inclusion of the mission statement in the catalog, all schedules of classes, meeting agendas, and on the website.

The College has provided evidence that over 80% of its employees attest that they are familiar with and contribute to the College mission. During on-campus interviews and informal meetings, faculty and staff seemed to be student-centered and dedicated to the needs of all students at LACC. Through the auspices of the Institutional Integrity Committee, the mission statement is reviewed and revised on a 6-year cycle and is vetted through all appropriate constituency groups with ultimate approval by the governing board. The most current mission statement was revised, reviewed, and approved during the 2013-14 academic year. As mentioned earlier, the College plans to review and revise its Distance Education mission statement. (Standard I.A.4, ER 6).

Conclusion:

The College meets this Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Standard I.B. - Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The college has a well-defined and documented integrated planning process that is implemented across the College. The College provided examples of the program review process as well as student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessment at the course, program, and institutional level. The College has institution-set standards for student achievement. Progress towards meeting these set standards occurs annually and the analysis is fed back to the institution to support ongoing improvement. Program level and institutional level outcomes assessment occurs via an embedded process with course level assessments. The College has recently incorporated the review of progress towards meetings defined student achievement outcomes into the program review process. The College has a number of plans that support the college-level Educational Strategic and Master Plan. The College also plans to develop and implement a formal Enrollment Management Plan to assist with and support resource allocation. A Distance Education Plan exists; however, concerted implementation is needed in order to provide quality and sustained online education to improve access and success for students.

Findings and Evidence

The College has a defined and established structure that supports substantial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and the continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. The structure is described in the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook. The handbook clearly details integrated planning and program review processes incorporated within the College's decision making and governance structure. Dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement occurs in academic departments, service areas, during program review, and in college governance committee meetings. The governance structure allows for all college constituencies to be involved in planning and decision making processes. Discussion on student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement is documented in committee minutes and reports. Student learning outcomes are reviewed and discussed at the department and college level. Student equity objectives are listed in the Student Equity Plan that is linked to strategic college objectives in the Educational Strategic and Master Plan (ESMP) and institutional-set standards. Dialog on meeting the strategies occurs in a number of college committees. (Standard I.B.1).

Information included in the self-evaluation along with additional evidence provided by the college during the site visit indicate that the institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. All courses have defined student learning outcomes and all instructional programs, certificates, and degrees have established Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs). Lack of complete alignment was observed between some course level and program level student learning outcomes. The College currently has 866 active courses that have at least one SLO assessed. Departments have Course and Program Assessment Plans that describe the assessment cycle. Student Learning Outcome Coordinators ensure that SLOs are assessed

and use to improve student learning. Learning outcome assessment is also a component of the annual program review process. (Standard I.B.2, ER11)

The College has established institution-set standards for student achievement, which are included in the ESMP. Review of the institution-set standards indicates their alignment with the college's mission. Various oversight committees, identified in the ESMP Implementation Grid, annually review data, track progress on meeting the standards, and recommend actions to improve associated measures. The ESMP Implementation Grid also tracks college progress towards meeting the institution-set standards. The institution-set standards for student achievement are clearly established and information on monitoring progress is clear. The institution-set standards are adequate for the institution. They include relevant and appropriate standards with documentation of collaborative dialog in setting the standards and target values. They are meaningful, measurable, and manageable. Assessment and dialog lead to actions supporting continuous improvement as evidenced by committee recommendations and program review plans and actions. (Standard I.B.3, ER 11).

The institution implements an integrated planning cycle that is focused on student learning and improvement. Each area completes an annual program review and a comprehensive program review every six years. Progress on department and unit objectives is reviewed, analyzed, and modified to support improvement in student learning and achievement as evidenced in program review documents. The annual program process also includes a review of disaggregated data for defined student success measures. Student institution-set standards identified in the ESMP are also assessed annually and the progress is reported and shared. The implementation of institutional processes defined in the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook ensure that plans are revised based upon review of student achievement data. The College is participating in the Achieving the Dream Reform Network. This has increased the use of disaggregated data sets in traditional and distance education courses. The institution is using assessment data to support student learning and achievement. (Standard I.B.4).

The institution has a well-defined program review process that includes an evaluation of goals and objectives as well as a review of data. This is evidenced by a review of Validated Program Reviews. Quantitative data for program review is disaggregated by program type and distance education. Board Rules state that program review shall link the College's mission with the educational master plan, department goals, and educational objectives. The College is in its third year of annual program reviews and updates leading up to a six-year comprehensive program in alignment with the six-year ESMP. The annual program review includes a review of and report on previous year learning outcomes and assessment activities. Distance education courses are evaluated within the units providing the courses. The College uses program review to assess accomplishment of its mission. Both qualitative and quantitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery. The data is reviewed during the annual program review process. (Standard I.B.5).

The College analyzes data on institutional learning outcomes disaggregated by ethnicity and gender. Student achievement data is disaggregated by additional factors including age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and traditional/distance education students. The use and analysis of disaggregated data is evidenced in program review data and validated reports,

in specific plans (e.g. Student Equity, Basic Skills, and Achieving the Dream), and in ESMP oversight committee data reviews and recommendations.

The College has developed plans and implementation strategies to address identified performance gaps. The Basic Skills Initiative plan lists improvement and interventions to improve outcomes in English as a second language (ESL), developmental mathematics, and English. The Student Equity plan incorporates a performance expectation to reduce percentage point gaps where equity disparity occurs. Goals and evaluation using disaggregated data occurs in Achieving the Dream initiatives and within the Distance Education plan. In addition, annual program reviews and the discussion of Course SLO (CSLO) assessments lead to plans, resource requests, and actions to address identified performance gaps. The Basic Skills Plan, Student Equity Plan, and Achieving the Dream Plan all integrate disaggregated data review with the identification of performance gaps leading to resource allocation to mitigate the identified gaps. The institution is preparing and reviewing disaggregated data to identify performance gaps in subpopulations of students. (Standard I.B.6).

The institution regularly evaluates practices across all areas of the institution to assure its effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the mission. The Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook is reviewed and evaluated every three years by the Strategic Planning Committee. Any changes are subject to review by the Academic Senate and College President. The current governance structure was established in 2013 and is documented in the Integrated Planning and Governance and the A New Model for Governance documents. The Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee (EPPIC) makes recommendations for educational policy on the College program review process, learning outcomes assessment, instructional budget allocation, and other topics related to educational planning and policy. The Academic Senate and supporting committees along with the College Council and supporting committees each have a defined role in reviewing and recommending policies and practice changes, which are moved forward to the College President for approval. The institution has made a number of changes in integrated planning processes including program review. Meetings with committee Chairs and Co-Chairs confirmed that committees are annually evaluating and assessing their performance in meeting their charge and contributing to the support of academic quality, effectiveness, and accomplishment of the College mission. (Standard I.B.7).

The College makes concerted efforts to communicate results of assessment and evaluation activities. A participatory governance structure and process exists that provides the opportunity for all College stakeholders to engage in planning and evaluation. Progress towards goals, program review results, and assessment results are communicated to the campus and available in summary reports posted to the College website. Results of assessment and evaluation activities are communicated in various ways that include summary reports, presentations, and postings to the website in order to develop understanding across the institution. Committee agendas, minutes, and reports are also posted to the website. A review of minutes and reports indicated that annual assessment and evaluation of planning, program review, effectiveness of committees, progress towards goals, and student learning outcomes occurs with the information posted and shared with the college community. Climate survey results indicate employee involvement with goal setting and annual review of

progress towards meeting unit goals. A delay in posting of some of the committee information to the website was observed. Additional efforts to have College overview and discussion of climate survey results would be helpful in supporting college-wide involvement in developing plans and priorities for improvement. (Standard I.B.8).

Institutional planning is clearly documented in the 2013 *District Governance and Functions Handbook*. As shown in the handbook, integration with District planning starts with the LACCD Strategic Plan Vision 2017 (DSP). Created collaboratively among key constituent groups from the College, the DSP generally integrates all the College strategic plans by establishing a common framework through four overarching goals. The most consistent alignment, however, occurs through the annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports that are reported to the Board of Trustees. Using a standard report template and common metrics and data sources developed collegially by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), the Colleges' map to the District goals, compare their progress against the District as a whole in their reviews, and provide an analysis of strengths and weaknesses in accomplishing planned objectives. These assessments, in turn, inform the Board of Trustees' annual goals as well as future College and District planning priorities.

The institution has a number of planning documents and processes in place to support ongoing systemic evaluation and planning. The ESMP is aligned with the District mission and strategic plan. The ESMP guides all college planning, program review, and assessment activities. The plans reviewed that support the ESMP include: Basic Skills Plan, Student Equity Plan, Student Success and Support Program Plan, Human Resources Plan, Staff and Organizational Development Plan, Achieving the Dream Initiatives, Technology Resources Plan, and Facilities Master Plan. All College level planning occurs within the framework of the ESMP and progress is reviewed and assessed annually. The College recognizes that development of an Enrollment Management Plan incorporating concepts and parameters for class and program scheduling and instructional modalities, marketing and outreach, and retention will help meet FTEs target, maintain and grow student enrollment, and support financial sustainability.

The College also has a Distance Education Plan 2015-2020 that is aligned with the ESMP. College needs to expand its current Distance Education Plan to include a section relating to Distance Education Pedagogy, incorporating related sections from ACCJC's Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education. The College should then implement the components of this plan, proceeding with an ongoing, systematic, quality assessment process for all online courses. There has not been college implementation of a systematic assessment process for all online courses. In addition, a review of online courses identified instances where there was limited or no student/instructor interaction in online courses. The implementation of ongoing assessment is needed to insure all online courses provide regular, substantive, and effective interaction. The Distance Education practices are discussed in further detail in Standard II. The college will be making efforts to monitor the quality of Distance Education offerings, evaluating student success data in online courses, and expand support services to improve and insure the quality of Distance Education courses offered. Required and documented Distance Education instructor training on requirements for quality online course development and implementation also needs to occur. (Standard I.B.9).

Educational, Student and Learning Services, and Administrative Services unit plans are developed as a result of the program review process and resource requests are developed to support the plans. Budget requests are prioritized by the Budget Committee. Systematic evaluation and planning is occurring that integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation focused on mission accomplishment and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. This will be further enhanced and supported by an Enrollment Management Plan. Eligibility Requirement 19 is met. (Standard I.B.9, ER19).

Conclusion

The College meets all standards except for Standard I.9.B and ER 19. The College does not meet this Standard, due to deficiencies related to Distance Education. The college does not have an ongoing and systematic quality assessment process for all online courses. The College needs to insure that all online courses are implemented in accordance with the practices described in its Distance Education Plan.

College Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College expand its current Distance Education Plan to include a section relating to Distance Education Pedagogy, incorporating related sections from ACCJC's Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education. The College should then implement the components of this plan, proceeding with an ongoing, systematic, quality assessment process for all online courses. This expanded plan for distance education, based on ACCJC's Guide, should outline all necessary practices the College would need to implement in order to meet standards, providing a road map for the College to come into compliance. The team further recommends that the college comply with 34 C.F.R. § 602.3 (as referenced in the ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education) to ensure that regular, substantive, and effective interaction is provided in Distance Education courses. (Standards I.B.9, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.5, II.A.7, II.A.12).

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College broadly communicate the results of all its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities, posting all committee meeting agendas, minutes, documents, and reports to the website in a timely manner. Campus climate and other survey results should be summarized, shared, and discussed with students, faculty, staff, and administration, including documentation of the discussion and resulting actions. (Standards I.B.8, IV.A.6, IV.A.7, IV.B.6).

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College organize its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement by reviewing course and program level alignment of student learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.2, I.C.4, II.A.3).

Standard I.C. - Institutional Integrity

General Observations:

Los Angeles City College makes available to students, faculty, staff, and the public clear, accurate, and updated information. The College has recently established an Institutional Integrity Committee to ensure that catalogs, schedules, and websites contain the most current and consistent information. Mission, learning outcomes, programs, support services, and accreditation status are included in the catalog and on the college's website. Within the Self-Evaluation, the College has referenced all ACCJC catalog requirements with corresponding page numbers. Based on the evidence provided, the College communicates matters of educational quality to the public primarily through its website and includes its current ACCJC accreditation status as well as the status of career and technical programs with external accrediting agencies.

In terms of the District, the Board has long-established policies on academic freedom, ethics, and freedom of speech to assure institutional and academic integrity. The District also has policies on standards of student conduct and prohibited practices such as discrimination and harassment that include elements of academic freedom. A noteworthy practice is the existence of a committee of the Academic Senate on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom which is charged with "regulating the ethical conduct of faculty and issues of academic freedom."

The Los Angeles Community College District has well-developed Board Rules that promote academic honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity that *ensure a faculty's right to teach and a student's right to learn*. These Board policies are posted on the District and College websites. Board Rule 9803 requires that the College president annually publicize the Standards of Conduct. The District also has a comprehensive policy on student discipline that delineates the process for student due process in the event of a violation of the student code of conduct. This information is available to students in the College catalogs as well as online via the college websites.

The LACCD Board of Trustees establishes policies that are consistent with its mission statement and exercises oversight of the colleges' educational programs by means of its Board Rules and Administrative Regulations (Board Rules, Chapter 1, Article 2).

Findings and Evidence:

The recent establishment of the Institutional Integrity Committee has resulted in providing oversight for the accuracy and integrity of information included in both the catalog and website. Evidence provided in this section included the committee's operating agreement, membership structure, and processes for decision making. In addition, in its Institutional Integrity Manual, the process for the updating and reviewing means of communication with the campus and the public is well delineated. During the site visit, the team met with both the Dean of Curriculum and the Institutional Integrity Chair to inquire about processes and communication. Meeting minutes and agendas were provided and dated August 2015.

In its Quality Focus Essay, LACC addresses the need to improve clarity, accuracy, and integrity by updating the website to make it more interactive and attractive to students interested in signature and low-enrolled programs. Given what appears to be low-enrolled programs and the College's need to recruit more students, this improvement will help increase the College's effectiveness in their enrollment management plan. (Standard I.C.1).

LACC has provided an outline referencing the ACCJC catalog requirements with specific page numbers in their most current catalog. Before and during the site visit, team members continued to notice that page iii listing the governing board members was missing in both the print and online version of the catalog. However, during the site visit, the latest online version of the catalog did, in fact, contain page iii listing the governing board members. After interviewing both the Dean of Curriculum and the Institutional Integrity Committee, the college acknowledged discovering the missing page, and subsequently made the correction prior to the team visit. Overall, the process for designing, editing, updating, and reviewing the annual catalog appears to be detailed. With the implementation of new software, the College plans to improve their existing process of catalog production. (Standard I.C.2, ER 20).

LACC has provided evidence of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLO) data as well as links to their website making information available to the public. In addition, minutes of dialogs on ISLO's have been included, documenting a campus-wide discussion among constituents. Data are incorporated into the program review process and utilized to measure progress made towards ESMP measures. (Standard I.C.3, ER 19)

The College has provided evidence demonstrating the description of certificate and degree programs, including expected learning outcomes and number of units required. LACC has also included the corresponding board policy on academic standards requiring faculty members to provide syllabi including "the approved course student learning outcomes."

Faculty is evaluated on whether they have included official SLO's on all syllabi. Team members conducted random samples of syllabi for the Spring 2016 semester and compared the SLO's with those on the official course outline of record. In many cases, the SLO's on Spring 2016 class syllabi matched those on the official course outline of record. Cases were discovered that course syllabi and official course outline SLO's were not consistent. (Standard I.C.4).

Regular review of information occurs at LACC. The Institutional Integrity Committee is charged with the revision and accuracy of college-wide publications and online information for the campus community and the public. Evidence includes the official process for updating information. The regular review of any changes in institutional policies and procedures is part of this process as confirmed during interviews with the Dean of Curriculum and Institutional Integrity Chair. In the Self-Evaluation, LACC mentions that "department chairs, deans, vice presidents, and the curriculum chair" thoroughly review the draft of the catalog for accuracy. As part of the site visit, the team verified minutes and agendas of the August 2015 meeting. (Standard I.C.5).

The College makes available to all current and prospective students information of the cost of tuition and other related fees as evidenced in the catalog and website. As part of the orientation process, detailed information of the cost of education and financial aid is made available. While LACC addresses the cost of course materials in the catalog, there is no link to the College Bookstore (page 16 of the catalog) to inform students of the costs of specific course textbooks. The Team suggests that this information be made available. (Standard I.C.6).

Related to District operations, the Board's policy on academic freedom specifies the faculty's right to teach and the student's right to learn. The Colleges widely publish their commitment to a learning environment that promotes free expression of thought and ideas in the college catalogs and some include it in the class schedule. The District's faculty contract (AFT) specifies that faculty shall have the *freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning for students*. The faculty contract also outlines the policies and procedures for protection of academic freedom.

In terms of LACC, the College published board policies on academic freedom and prohibited discrimination have been included as well as the existence and location of the designated free speech area. An appropriate Academic Senate committee establishes reviews and updates policies related to this substandard. Students are asked about the expression of their opinions and discrimination-free learning environments on faculty evaluations. (Standard I.C.7, ER 13)

The Los Angeles Community College District demonstrates a clear commitment to academic integrity and personal responsibility. The District has established, and routinely publishes, Board policies and administrative regulations that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity that apply to all constituencies, including students taking online classes (Board Rules 9803-9806 and 91101). Policies include definitions of, and expectations for, honest and ethical behavior. The District has a student code of conduct which includes academic honesty. The District also has policies and procedures for addressing student discipline and complaints. These policies and procedures are communicated to students in college catalogs and on the District and college websites. In accordance with Board Rule 6703.10, faculty is required to include an expectation of academic integrity for students in their class syllabi.

The District has a number of policies and administrative regulations in place to promote honesty, responsibility, ethical conduct, and academic integrity that apply to all forms of delivery and constituencies, including visitors to the campuses. There are several commendable practices pertaining to academic integrity at the various colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). For example, Los Angeles Valley College prints a statement on academic dishonesty on the cover of examination books and includes a line for the student's signature. The online course management system used by some colleges, Etudes, is developing a student authentication for online classes that will require the student to answer a random question that pertains to individually identifiable information about the student contained in the Student Information system before taking an exam or submitting assignments. East Los Angeles College (ELAC) instructors will be piloting the

new functionality. Students at ELAC take an honor pledge before taking online assessments and LACCD has a Board rule that requires faculty to include a statement in the syllabi about the student code of conduct including academic honesty on the syllabi.

In terms of LACC, the College publishes its Standards for Student Conduct including policies on academic honesty in the catalog. Additional evidence provided demonstrates that the College has established policies applicable to all constituencies. The catalog contains all related board policies.

The self-evaluation states that all syllabi are required “to include a statement on the student code of conduct and academic dishonesty.” Academic Affairs newsletters provided by the College during the site visit communicate the importance of including such policies on all syllabi. Additional evidence demonstrating student understanding of codes of conduct was extremely clear based on a student survey administered in fall 2014. (Standard I.C.8).

LACC has processes and policies in place to determine that faculty deliver course material in an objective manner. The Code of Ethics demonstrates the College’s commitment to holding professionally accepted views while remaining fair and open. The evidence also referenced the faculty evaluation process, which includes a specific question for students to evaluate a faculty member’s ability to create an open and safe learning environment.

To ensure that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views, the College has policies in place that require faculty to abide by the objectives and outcomes stated on the official Course Outline of Record, and to include the approved course student learning outcomes on all syllabi. In addition, the College states in the self-evaluation that faculty must follow the course outline of record as part of their evaluation. Specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, and students are provided in the District Board Rules and the college catalog. (Standards I.C.8, I.C.9, I.C.10).

Currently, LACC has no sites operating outside of the state or the country. (Standard I.C.11)

A careful review of the historical documents related to accreditation reveals that the District adheres to the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements and Standards. The District website maintains a Planning and Accreditation webpage whereby the District publicly discloses information regarding accreditation. All college self-evaluation reports are posted to the website as well as District responses and evidence for the reports. Recent follow-up reports and correspondence from the Commission are posted. The Educational Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division in the Educational Services Center (ESC) provides support and coordination for college accreditation efforts. In particular, EPIE assists College personnel in coordinating accreditation efforts for comprehensive site visits and midterm and progress reports; provides College accreditation leaders information in support of District wide accreditation issues; monitors College progress in responding to Commission recommendations; serves as liaison to the Board of Trustees and the chancellor on all issues related to college accreditation; coordinates the production, review, and revision of the “Functional Map” of District/College responsibilities and duties; monitors and interprets ACCJC Standards and policies; and coordinates responses to accreditation standards that reference multi-college District or District-level functions. Much of this coordinating effort

occurs in the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), which is comprised of the Colleges' ALOs, faculty leaders with accreditation and planning, deans of institutional research and planning, District Academic Senate appointees, representatives from District Committees, and ESC administrators.

LACCD has provided an analysis and corresponding evidence demonstrating how it complies with all requirements, standards, and policies set forth the by the Commission. In addition, it conveys matters of educational quality and institutional effectiveness, including any institutional reports, on the College's website. Since 2009, the College has submitted all required reports to ACCJC and has provided links to each report within its self-evaluation. (Standard I.C.12, ER 21)

The District and the colleges have numerous relationships with external agencies. The District works in tandem with the Colleges to submit all required data and reports to the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the U.S. Department of Education, external agencies, and accrediting agencies. The District coordinates the submission of MIS data requirements to the state, along with accurate and timely submission of reports and budgets such as those required for the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) and Student Equity funding. All required data for IPEDS reporting is also coordinated at the District. Working collaboratively with the Colleges, the District's Central Financial Aid Unit complies with Federal Title IV regulations affecting the administration of financial aid programs. This includes regular submission of required data and reports, adherence to federal program reviews and audits, and quickly addressing any noted areas of noncompliance in any findings. The Contract and Purchasing Office in the Business Services Division of the District publicly advertises requests for bids and proposals for qualified suppliers and consultants through the District's website. All open requests, vendor forms and directions, and contact information for District contract and procurement personnel are provided. The District communicates information regarding accredited status through the Planning and Accreditation webpage. All correspondence from the Commission are posted on the webpage, including the College self-evaluation and follow-up reports and the associated evidence.

The College posts communication and updates on the accreditation status of the following programs with external licensure and requirements: Nursing, Dietetics, Radiologic Technology, Dental Technology, and Paralegal as evidenced on the College's website under "College Council." Letters from external agencies reaffirming accreditation or changes in accreditation status are also made public through this venue. In addition, LACC has provided information that any deficiencies in programs are appropriately addressed to bring programs into compliance. (Standard I.C.13, ER 21).

The Board is responsible for policy and exercises oversight over student success, persistence, retention, and quality (BR 2100). The Board exercises oversight of the District's educational programs and has established an Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee to monitor the integrity, quality, and improvement of student learning programs and services. (Standard I.C.14).

The Board of Trustees is kept regularly informed on key indicators of student learning and achievement through the IESS. Additionally, Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review of the Colleges' academic quality and institutional plans. The annual review and analysis of the state's Student Success Scorecard completion data and the resultant Board discussion has focused on strategies for improving student success and academic quality.

To demonstrate meeting this standard, the College has included the Final Budgets of 2014-15 and 2015-16. As stated in the self-evaluation, the College does not generate financial returns for investors nor does it support external interests. (Standard I.C.14, ER 21).

Conclusion

The College meets this Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

The District meets the Standard I.C in all parts and ER 13. The Los Angeles Community College District is committed to principles of academic freedom and ethical behavior. The District assures institutional and academic integrity through adherence to Board of Trustee policies on academic freedom that commit to a learning environment in which intellectual freedom exists for faculty and students to explore and critically examine knowledge. This commitment is reflected throughout the organization in a variety of ways including Board policies, mission statements, institutional core values, faculty contracts and governance handbooks that are readily available. This commitment is communicated to students and the public via college catalogs and websites, along with student evaluations at some or all of the colleges.

The Board of Trustees' IESS committee keeps them informed on issues involving academic quality, student achievement, and student learning. The District meets Standard I.C in all parts.

STANDARD II

STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Standard II.A. – Instructional Programs

General Observations

The transfer of credit policies are established by the District in Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. There is no District oversight in ensuring consistency in the application of these policies. The nine colleges maintain articulation agreements with public and private accredited institutions both in-state and out- of-state. The District does not have any role in the development or maintenance of articulation agreements.

Los Angeles City College has a large and diverse set of course and program offerings. The College offers 65 Degrees and 76 Certificates. The College has a Distance Education (DE) program with plans for expansion; however, at this time, no programs are offered 100 percent through DE. The College does not offer baccalaureate degrees. LACC offers five programs with specialized accreditation or licensure. The College offers a number of courses, both credit and noncredit, that are below the level of curriculum to satisfy requirements for either degrees or transfer. These include all community service courses, noncredit, and learning skills courses. The College offers Career Technical Education programs in Nursing, Dietetics, Radiologic Technology, Dental technology, and Paralegal. These programs are required to meet the requirements of their respective external accrediting commissions.

Findings and Evidence

The District has well-established policies and regulations in place for acceptance of a wide range of transfer credits including: standardized tests, external exams, International Baccalaureate, military credits, Advanced Placement, courses completed at international institutions, and acceptance of upper division courses to meet lower division requirements. These policies align with state regulations, the policies of California State University and University of California, and other transfer institutions, as well as with generally accepted practices in higher education. This information is published in the College catalogs and on the websites. The awarding of transfer credits is the responsibility of each College and is reflected on the student's permanent record, maintained in the Student Information System (DEC). Each college currently issues its own student transcripts, however, this will change with the new PeopleSoft system where there will be one District transcript reflecting credits taken throughout the District. There is no District monitoring of the consistency of the awarding of transfer credits.

The information presented to students in College publications is thorough and comprehensive. While some colleges specified that they do not specifically examine student learning outcomes in the process of evaluating transfer credits, the acceptance of transfer credits by the institutions implies that the expected learning outcomes are comparable.

Each of the nine Colleges maintained articulation agreements with public and private accredited institutions both in-state and out-of-state. These agreements are contained in ASSIST, the state's recognized articulation database for use by students and employees that advises students. The establishment and maintenance of articulation agreements is the responsibility of the college faculty. The District does not have a role in developing articulation agreements.

The instructional programs of the College are guided by the mission statement and through the Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP). The establishment of instructional programs and services is based on the ESMP. The mission statement focuses on providing learner centered pathways to success through transfer, career and technical education, and foundational skills programs. The College has enhanced the student experience by providing a comprehensive and integrated delivery of services to support the students' academic success. (Standard II.A.1).

To achieve an Associate Degree, students must complete a minimum of 21 semester units total in general education, with specific unit requirements in each of five areas: natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, language and rationality, and health and physical education. The College follows policy that all degrees include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. In addition to aligning with one of the five required general education areas, courses must align with one of the 11 ISLOs that include the knowledge, skills, and abilities included in the list of required outcomes. (Standard II.A.1, II.A.11, II.A.12, II.A.13; ER9, ER10, ER11).

The College Distance Education Committee is responsible for developing policies that ensure the quality and effectiveness of the DE program. In collaboration with the Academic Senate, the DE Committee prepares faculty to teach DE courses. The College has a current Distance Education Plan and a Distance Education Faculty Handbook that serve as resources to employees. While the College provides professional development opportunities on pedagogical approaches to DE, the Team found the plan to be significantly lacking in its specific plan, standards, and goals for distance education pedagogy. (Standard II.A.1).

All instructional programs at the College are required to participate in annual and comprehensive program review, which results in unit planning objectives to support ESMP objectives and improvement measures. Each academic program completes a comprehensive Program Review with annual updates. The reviews for academic programs include analysis of the following topics: Course completion rates; total enrollment; sections; semester WSCH/FTEF; PT FTEF Ratio; Department Level Analysis of Disaggregated Achievement Measures; past academic year comparison of success rates between Distance Education and traditional sections; Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement; and Curriculum Assessment (includes SLOs: "explain how curriculum has been revised in alignment with SLOs, developments in the field of study, or articulation requirements.") Program reviews of academic programs assess student learning and use the results of this assessments to make improvements in teaching and learning processes. The review also includes a review by the area Dean, the Vice President, and the EPPIC Committee. Initiation of new programs goes through EPPIC. A program is only approved once there is demonstrable need for the

program. Regardless of the processes in place, the Distance Education courses reviewed by the Team were found lacking in generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. In many courses, syllabi were missing, outcomes were missing, and there was no faculty initiated regular and effective contact with the students. (Standard II.A.2; ER 9).

The College faculty is responsible for the course content and methods of instruction that meet generally accepted standards and expectations of the official course outline of record. The College Course outlines are updated every five years and include requisites, advisories, course content and objectives, SLOs, and methods of instruction. Course outlines of record are developed collaboratively within the department, approved locally by the Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate, and approved at the district level by the Board of Trustees. All faculty teaching DE are certified in the approved CMS platform and are trained in online pedagogy. (Standard II.A.2, ER11).

The College faculty is responsible for defining and assessing learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. According to College Policy, all courses, both credit and noncredit, will have at least two approved CSLOs which appear on officially approved and current course outlines. In section two of the course outlines, all courses include what CSLOs and ILOs and how they will be assessed. The SLOs on the course outlines are broken out into three sections: Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Overarching Course Outcome; SLO Authentic Assessment Performance Task; and SLO Achievement Criteria. (II.A.3, ER11).

The College has established procedures for assessing course, program, certificate, and degree learning outcomes. All Institutional SLOs (ISLOs), Program SLOs (PSLOs) and Course SLOs (CSLOs) are assessed through the annual assessments using eLumen. Each department has an assigned faculty SLO Department Coordinator. At their department meetings, the SLO coordinators organize SLO discussions and have access to eLumen to see progress on SLOs for the department. Course level student learning outcomes and their assessments are in the College's eLumen Program (not accessible to students) and discussed in program reviews. The Student Learning Outcome Advisory Committee (SLOAC) creates and evaluate the academic program SLO processes, the assessment reports, and provide committee annual report. The SLOAC coordinator works with faculty on development of course and program SLOs and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness assists in the assessment. According to the District/Faculty contract, the CSLOs are required to be available to students on the course syllabi. (Standard II.A.3, II.A.11, ER10, ER11).

The standard calls for every section, students must receive a course syllabus that includes outcomes from the institutions officially approved course outline. The Team did not find this to be the case. A random sampling of face to face classes and online classes found that some of the courses did not have outcomes that matched the institutions officially approved course outline. Further, in the sample of the online classes, some courses had no syllabus at all. (Standard II.A.3).

All SLO changes go through the curriculum process and are changed both in the course outline of record by the proposing discipline faculty, and after approval, they are added to the eLumen assessment program by the SLOAC coordinator. The SLOAC committee produces annual eLumen assessment action reports for the departments. Departments are

required to implement actions from their action plans within two years and assess the implementation. Departments are required to assess 25% of CSLOs each year. (ER11).

The College has a multi-pronged method to insure that CSLOs are identical on the course outline of record and the syllabi. The District and the faculty contract mandates that CSLOs are on the syllabi. The College has assigned “course captains” to assist faculty in placing the individual course SLOs on syllabi for course sections. SLO department coordinators are responsible for the departments’ CSLOs. Ultimately, the department chairs are charged with overall responsibility. Finally, spot checks are done in the Academic Affairs Office. However, the team found that there were instances where the CSLO on the Course Outline of Record did not match the CSLOs on the syllabi. (Standard II.A.3, ER11).

The SLOAC Coordinator stated that the College first created course outcomes in 2007. In 2012, program outcomes were addressed. Now the two are mapped. The SLOAC Committee has recommended in its 2015 committee assessment that the departments look at the program outcomes as they relate to course SLOs to make sure the Program SLOs are broad enough for good assessments. (Standard II.A.3, ER11).

The College offers a number of courses, both credit and noncredit, that are below the level of curriculum that satisfies requirements for either degrees or transfer. These include all community service courses, noncredit and learning skills courses, Math 105, Math 112, Math 100, English 67, English 20, English 97, and ESL levels 2-5. These courses are distinguished from college-level curriculum in the catalog and directly support the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum. (Standard II.A.4).

All degrees and certificates have an identified course sequence, and all Associate degrees are 60 units or over. The College does not offer baccalaureate degrees. The College has in place policies to govern both course offerings and programs that conclude with degrees and certificates. The curriculum committee’s role is governed by the Integrated Governance and Planning Handbook. The six-year program review process allows the disciplines the space and structure to review, assess, and improve their programs relative to their students achieve their educational goals. Over the past five years, the College has approved 10 Associate of Art, three Associate of Science, 14 Associate Degrees for Transfer, and 11 certificates of achievement. (Standards II.A.5, II.A.9, ER3-1, ER10, ER12).

The College expects that courses toward a degree should be taken in sequence so that a full-time student can complete a degree program in two years. The College expects that courses toward a certificate are also arranged in sequence so that a full-time student can complete the certificate program within the time normally needed to complete. The College program approval process requires a description of how required courses should be taken in sequence so that a full-time student can complete a degree program in two years. This is generally true, except in the case of a high-unit technical or health occupation program where a case has been made that a sequence longer than two years is definitely necessary. This is disclosed to potential students. The College closely monitors and examines the length of time it takes students to complete degrees and the length of time it takes students to complete the unit load to earn each certificate of achievement. (Standards II.A.5, ER9).

SLOs for DE classes are identical to those taught in the face-to-face courses. A required DE Addendum is attached to the course outline of record and includes online delivery requirements and methods of instruction that define regular and effective contact with the instructor. As part of faculty evaluations, instructors are assessed based on whether they initiate “regular, systematic, and substantive student contact.” In a comprehensive review of over 50% of the online courses, the Team did not find that “regular, systematic, and substantive student contact” was being initiated. While all faculty teaching DE is certified in the approved CMS platform, there needs to be more training in online pedagogy. Through interviews with college staff it was corroborated that faculty are trained with Etudes through a specially designed course. Faculty can also enroll in @One courses or any other educational source that offers courses on online pedagogies/methodologies. The College also offers professional development opportunities through Flex Days. There are also professional opportunities through the College Staff Development Committee. Per conversations and interviews with college personnel, additional professional development opportunities are also being sponsored through the Student Equity Plan. This was corroborated with a review of the previously mentioned document. (Standards II.A.7).

The College offers Online Advising and Online Chat with counselors. Both of these services are offered though limited hours each week. Students might have to wait for a response for over 72 hours. Per information shared during the interviews, the software used by the College allows for one counselor to log in at a time. Students exclusively enrolled in DE courses must come to campus to meet with a counselor and complete an educational plan. (Standards II.A.7).

The Mathematics Department administers the only department-wide course examination and has validated the effectiveness of the examination to reduce test bias and enhance reliability. Additionally, as part of program review, departments assess the effectiveness of DE courses and the programs to which those courses align, and units compare success rates in DE and traditional courses. The College has an institution-set standard for satisfactory DE course completion. The expectation for DE course completion is the same as for traditional courses. The College Distance Education Committee is responsible for developing policies that ensure the quality and effectiveness of the DE program where fifteen of the 19 committee members are faculty. (Standards II.A.8).

In terms of the award of course credit, degrees, and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes, the College ensures that all courses have learning outcomes that are overarching statements describing course content critical and central to success in the course. CSLOs are assessed using authentic, embedded assessments. Student performance on learning outcomes factors into the final course grade and the awarding of course credit. In this way, course credit is awarded based on student attainment of CSLOs. Credits awarded are consistent with accepted norms in higher education. The College currently has 14 state approved Associate of Arts degrees for Transfer. In order for those degrees to be approved by the state, the requisite courses had to follow the approved course descriptors and units to achieve C-ID alignment. For transferrable courses that do not have a final descriptor in C-ID, the College awards units of credit based on norms accepted in the state and articulation agreements with public and private four-year institutions. The College’s Articulation Officer reviews comparable courses at UC, CSU, and private schools and uses the California

Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC). The articulation officer reviews these areas in the course outline of record before the course is considered for approval by the Curriculum Committee. When adding or updating a course, the online curriculum system automatically calculates the correct number of course hours to ensure compliance with all requirements concerning assignment of credit hours. (Standards II.A.9).

College Policies are made available to students in the catalog, which is available online. Information includes general information for transfer, transfer of career education classes, course credit value, University of California (UC) transfer requirements and advanced standing admission, California State University (CSU) admission requirements and transfer information, Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) policy, and policies for admission to independent colleges. (Standards II.A.10).

The College adheres to District transfer policies and various administrative regulations for acceptance of credits. Policies are made available to students in the catalog, which is available online. Information includes general information for transfer, transfer of career education classes, course credit value, UC transfer requirements and advanced standing admission, CSU admission requirements and transfer information, IGETC policy, CSU general education certification, and policies for admission to independent colleges. The College supports several study abroad programs. Student achievement of the intended outcomes is determined by analyzing course assessment results. (Standards II.A.10).

The Colleges all have numerous articulation agreements in place and rely on ASSIST as the primary repository of those agreements. The development and maintenance of articulation agreements is the responsibility of the individual college faculty. The District does not have a role in these articulation agreements. The College does not offer a program entirely online and, therefore, does not have articulation agreements for DE programs. The College considers transfer of credit for DE courses in the same manner as for traditional courses. (Standard II.A.10, ER 10).

The College has three “Areas” of institutional focus for its curriculum. These Areas are as follows: 1) “Essential Academic Skills,” 2) “Personal Growth and Development,” and 3) “Interpersonal/Intercultural/Global Awareness.” There are more specific outcomes within each Area. Altogether, there are 11 institutional student learning outcomes that include communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives. These 11 Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) are the skills and abilities that students are expected to have mastered by the time they graduate from Los Angeles City College. They are acquired through learning opportunities in and out of the classroom during the students’ academic experience at the college. (Standards II.A.11).

The College requires a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy. This philosophy is shared in the College Catalog and reads in part as follows:

The completion of the associate degree is the culmination of a student’s successful completion of learning experiences designed to develop certain capabilities and insights. Among these are the ability to think critically and to

communicate clearly and effectively both orally and in writing; to use mathematics; to understand the modes of inquiry of the major disciplines; to be aware of other cultures and times; to achieve insights gained through experience in thinking about ethical problems; and to develop the capacity for understanding. (Standards II.A.12, ER12).

The College follows policy that all degrees include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. All degrees have PSLOs that are statements of the core skills, performance abilities, attitudes, and/or values that students should possess at the completion of an entire course of study. All degrees have associated curriculum maps that identify the courses and CSLOs where PSLOs are mastered. Per Board Rule, to earn an associate degree or associate degree for transfer, students must complete a minimum of 60 semester units of course credit in a selected curriculum with at least 18 semester units of study in a major or area of emphasis. The College offers 53 Associate Degrees and 14 ADT degrees with each including focused study in an area of inquiry. (Standards II.A.13).

All career-technical certificates and degrees include CSLOs and PSLOs to meet expected technical and professional competencies. The College verifies and maintains currency of employment opportunities and external factors through a variety of means. Each new career-technical certificate or degree must include justification through enrollment and completion projections, labor market information, occupational demand data, and a survey of prospective employers. (Standards II.A.14, II.A.16).

In the past few years, the College has used the findings of the program reviews to identify programs for further analysis. Several large viability studies have been conducted within the past few years. In 2012, Economics moved from Social Sciences to Business Administration to better mirror the Cal State and UC systems. In 2013, the Learning Skills department underwent viability to streamline the department and align pre-collegiate Math and English curricula with college-level curricula. The intercollegiate sport program was cancelled in 2010. In 2014-15, Media Arts and Art were condensed into a single department to better share resources. The College has a process to phase out discontinued programs. (Standards II.A.15, II.A.16).

Conclusion

The District meets the standards with exception of the elements of II.A.2, II.A.3, and II.A.7 as they relate to distance education.

College Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College expand its current Distance Education Plan to include a section relating to Distance Education Pedagogy, incorporating related sections from ACCJC's Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education. The College should then implement the components of this plan, proceeding with an ongoing, systematic, quality assessment process for all online courses. This expanded plan for distance education, based on ACCJC's Guide, should outline all necessary practices the College would need to implement in order to meet standards, providing a road map for the College to come into compliance. The team further recommends that the college comply with 34 C.F.R. § 602.3 (as referenced in the ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education) to ensure that regular, substantive, and effective interaction is provided in Distance Education courses. (Standards I.B.9, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.5, II.A.7, II.A.12).

Additionally, Distance Education (DE) courses are required to include the course syllabus in the respective course shell, however, a review of a random sample selection of distance education course shells proved that not all courses contained course syllabi. Many of the same sampling of DE courses were found to lack substantive and regular contact between the instructor and students. (Standards II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.7).

Standard II.B. - Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

All the colleges adhere to Board policy pertaining to intra-library loans and have strong collaboration pertaining to providing learning support for students. 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.

The College lists the following learning support services in the standard: The MLK Library; the Music and the Children's Library of LACC; CalWORKs; Career Center; Counseling Center; EOP&S; International Students Program; Guardian Scholars Program; Office of Special Services; Ralph Bunche Scholars Program; Upward Bound; and Veterans Resource Center. Tutorial services are provided by the Learning Skills; EOP&S; Guardian Scholars; Office of Special Services; Trio and the Veterans Resource Center as well as the discipline areas of Chemistry and Earth Sciences; Child Development (for mathematics); English and ESL; Mathematics; Nursing; and Physics. (Standard II.B.1 and ER 17).

Findings and Evidence

MLK Library:

The MLK Library provides all of the services and access that a modern library provides, including collections (web based and print), reference (face to face and online chat), computer labs, reserves, and bibliographic/information competency instruction. The MLK Library is open seven days a week for a total of 77.5 hours in spring 2016, including access to the Reference Desk and to computers. The MLK Library has 192 computers for students, 18 group study rooms, and 2 classrooms with 98 more computers. The MLK Library collection consists of 117,073 titles (150,200 volumes), 95 periodical subscriptions, 1,127 DVDs/CDs, and 2,077 textbooks on reserve. The virtual collection, which also supports distance education and outreach students, is available 24/7 on and off campus. This collection provides access to 188,000 eBooks and over 50 databases. The textbook reserve collection includes approximately 80 percent of all textbooks required for courses. The MLK Library offers a Library Science 101 class; bibliographic instruction/library orientation workshops; one-on-one Reference Desk assistance and chat. There are also departmental libraries (Child Development, Law/Administration of Justice, Music, Nursing, and Theater). (Standard II.B.1, ER17).

The MLK library has an established collection development policy to guide in the selection of material that the students need to access for their research needs. The MLK Library's collections are diverse in formats and subject scope. Librarians are responsible for collecting the materials and databases used by the students. The librarians use a number of data

sources, including faculty and course outlines to inform them of student needs. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2).

Through the MLK Library's webpages, all on-campus and distance education students have equal online access to library resources, including fully digital serials and book databases, reference materials, and librarians. The MLK Library has online chat reference, APA, MLA and Chicago style manuals and other useful online handouts concerning research. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2).

The Library engages in the comprehensive and annual program review and student learning outcomes assessments. The library provides an average of 126 class orientations to an average of 4,055 students. In the Library Science course, student success, retention and completion rates are above the college average. The library uses four SLOs in its course for assessments. One SLO is assessed per semester. The library states in the program review assessment section how it has improved the course based on the assessments. In the program review, there are a number of quantitative measures (e.g., gate counts, reference questions, database usage, and circulation amounts), but no benchmarks have been established against which to compare these measurements. The Team suggests this be explored. (Standard II.B.3).

Faculty is encouraged to work with the librarians on the collections for their areas of expertise. In the Student Survey (2012), the students rate the library higher in the various satisfaction measures when compared to its sister college libraries. In the report, the MLK Library stated that it created its own in-house survey for students. The library found that the "findings of this survey show that students are satisfied with the service they are receiving at the reference desk." However, only 12 forms were completed by students, so the "n" was small. The Team suggests that the library continue to work with the Office of Research to produce surveys that are more widely disseminated in order to get better and more complete results. The team also recommends that the library work with the Office of Research's own task of better surveying for the needs of distance education students. (Standard II.B.3)

Students from any College in the District can check out books from any other library in the District or request that a book from another District library be sent to their local campus library and has reciprocal arrangement with California State University, Los Angeles. (Standard II.B.4).

Other Departments addressed in the Self Evaluation II.B Standard Report:

All of the other learning support services engage in the comprehensive and annual program review process. The learning support service units assessed their non-instructional student services using the service unit outcomes (SUO) processes. The program reviews are up-to-date and identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. Most areas of concerns in the program reviews relate to funding and staffing needs that the college will address in its planning processes. One unit, the Learning Skills department, went through a college viability process, which identified specific needs of that department. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3).

The College's tutorial programs are decentralized and are managed and maintained by separate departments. The Learning Skills department focuses on basic skills Math and

English students while the rest of the departments and their tutorials services are discipline or student cohort based. Only one tutorial program is currently available to distance education students, the pilot “Net Tutor for English Students.” The rest of the tutoring services are only available on campus. Tutorial services are included as part of the program reviews of the Learning Skills, EOP&S, Guardian Scholars, Office of Special Services, Trio and the Veterans Resource Center as well as the discipline areas of Chemistry and Earth Sciences, Child Development (for math), English and ESL, Mathematics, Nursing, and Physics. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.)

The team visited two department libraries, the “Children’s Library at LA City College” and the Music Library. Both libraries are included in their parent program’s program review. The Children’s Library includes 5000 books organized by topics and supports the lab school. The Music library collection consists of print books, manuscripts, music scores, journals and music in various formats.

All of the learning support services have a web presence that includes information on their services for both on-campus and distance education students. The College uses the EUREKA and KUDER online services for students to have access to online education and career planning. (Standard II.B.3).

The District has a long-standing practice of collaboration for library and learning support for its instructional programs. The District has a policy that facilitates intra-library loans for its students. This reciprocal agreement allows students to request material to be sent to another library within the District, generally within one week. Students also have the option to drive to another college to pick up materials on loan.

The District does not have a role in documenting formal collaborative agreements pertaining to library and other learning support services for instructional programs. The development and maintenance of these agreements is the responsibility of the individual colleges. The colleges also have subscriptions for online databases, tutoring programs, and career planning tools. The District libraries use the California Community College Library Consortium to purchase electronic resources which is the most cost-effective approach. The colleges also have reciprocal agreements with the libraries at the local California State University campuses and refer students to the local public libraries for various materials that may not be available.

The institutions are responsible for assuring the security, maintenance and reliability of the services provided. District Information Technology is responsible for maintaining the software and websites. It should be noted that not all the colleges address security and maintenance measures in their reports. The District does not have a role other than the District wide contract with the Sherriff’s Department for campus security services. Indications were that these services were effective for the college community. (Standards II.B.4).

Conclusions:

The College meets this Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Standard II.C. - Student Support Services

General Observations

The College defines its student support services to include Admissions and Records; Assessment Services; Career Center; Financial Aid; Foster and Kinship Care; General Counseling; International Student Services; School Relations and Outreach; Student Life and Leadership; University Transfer Center; and Veterans Affairs. Other more specialized program within Student services include California Work Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids (CalWORKs); Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE); Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOP&S), Guardian Scholars; Office of Special Services (OSS); TRIO SSS; Upward Bound; and Veterans Affairs.

The Student Services organization is staffed with a group of innovative and energetic student services professionals who create a welcoming and supportive environment for students. Recent increases in categorical funding sources, such as Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), EOP&S, and Student Equity have provided much needed resources to meet student needs.

The District has adopted, and the colleges adhere to, admission policies that are consistent with the mission and specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. These policies are published in catalogs and class schedules as well as available on websites. In addition, academic programs that have special admission/selection processes such as nursing and radiologic technology include this information in program applications/websites.

The District and colleges have high standards for the confidentiality, maintenance, release, and destruction of student records. District policies and practices have been developed in accordance with state and federal law and are strictly followed. There are a number of safeguards in place to protect the confidentiality of student records, including: requiring photo identification to access records information in person; nightly back up of the databases; adherence to a records classification and destruction system; and restricting access through the use of controlled passwords that are automatically changed every 90 days.

Findings and Evidence:

LACC has developed a comprehensive methodology for the assessment of Student Learning Outcomes and Service Unit Outcomes. The Academic Senate has been designated, via the Educational Policies and Program Integrity Committee Operating Agreement, the responsible body for all Program Review activities, including Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services. The Program Review process operates on a six-year cycle with a Comprehensive Review in the first year, followed by annual updates. The ongoing assessment results in Unit Planning Objectives. (Standard II.C.1).

The most recent Climate Survey comparing student responses from 2013 to 2014 resulted in a majority of Student Services Units reporting improvements with Admissions & Records (76% 2013, 85% 2014) and the Career Center (63% 2013, 69% 2014) showing the largest percentage in improvement. (Standard II.C.1).

The College self-study report focuses on the program reviews and assessments to identify improvement needs to its programs as they serve students. Specific to student services are the identification of SLO/SUO assessments and the requirement to identify the source and determination of the standard for assessment. Included are the Description, the Standard, how the standard was determined, and in another section of the review, the staff, student and unit (local) survey results. As in all the reviews, the section on SWOC analysis is included. The reviews vary in number of assessments, needs of the units, and their conclusions. (Standard II.C.2).

The LACC Student Services units identified in the report as conducting on-going SLO/SUO assessments do not all have evidence that they have assessed their SLOs. While the Self-Evaluation Report stated that several of the units did not have any evidence included for more recent annual updates (Evidence ST1C-27): Assessment (missing 14-15), Counseling (missing 13-14, 14-15), Financial Aid (missing 13-14), First Year Experience (missing 13-14, 14-15), the College was able to produce results from a previous assessment model dating back to 2010.

A new Vice President of Student Services was hired fifteen months prior to the completion of the self-study. This individual provided significant guidance for Student Services units to develop SLOs/SUOs. The SLO Committee added two student services representatives and has worked collaboratively with the Student Services Council to develop a well-written Handbook for Student Services Assessment Process. The Handbook and SLO Committee have resulted in all 18 units participating in the process and assessing at least one SLO each year. The assessment data is used to develop department planning objectives. The outlined process is well connected to Program Review and related LACC planning documents and procedures. (Standard II.C.2).

LACC provides and assures quality access to its services predominantly in an in-person format. These services are available to students in a variety of locations on campus and most provide limited evening hours in addition to a traditional daytime schedule. The College provides limited student services to students taking courses in a Distance Education format. The primary services for a student to enroll in courses are available in a distance education format (orientation, advisement (counseling), admissions, and financial aid. The College has plans to expand online tutoring services in fall 2016. LACC Student Services has not centralized the availability of online student services on the college's website. A newly hired Dean of Liberal Arts & Distance Education is being partially funded via SSSP funds to help develop more robust online student services. To accommodate evening students, several student services units (Admissions & Records, Counseling, Financial Aid, and Health and Wellness Center) remain open in the evening. (Standard II.C.3).

LACC offers appropriate co-curricular programs that align with the mission of the institution. The programs and activities are assigned to units and are aligned with appropriate planning documents. The College does not offer intercollegiate sports and has provided a substantiated viability report outlining what would be required to re-establish the program. The report notes that intercollegiate sports were suspended due in large part to severe budget cuts that began in 2008. The viability report supports re-establishing intercollegiate sports, and both the Academic Senate and President support this once budget issues have been resolved. The team met with student leadership and a consistent theme heard during the site

visit is that students hold a high priority for the College to re-establish this important community program. (Standard II.C.4).

LACC has 19 full-time counselors that are fully qualified to provide educational planning; evaluation of transcripts; review of transferability of courses, degrees, and certificates; major preparation; prerequisite checks; and academic progress. Recent vacancies in the counseling department have created challenges for the department to keep up with the demand for services. LACC is currently in the process to recruit 8 new full-time counselors to meet increased demand and fill existing vacancies in the various counseling area specialties (general counseling, EOPS, OSS, etc.). Assessment of counseling services indicates that a large number of new students do not complete new SSSP required services (ST2C-29). The assessment conducted through the Program Review process highlights some infrastructure and resource challenges related to the Counseling Department. (Standard II.C.5).

The District has admissions policies consistent with its mission and state regulations. These policies include special admission of part- and full-time K-12 students, F-1 students, noncitizens, and persons who do not possess a high school diploma or equivalent. The colleges all adhere to these policies when admitting students. These policies are published in catalogs and class schedules, as well as available on websites. The colleges also have developed and adhere to admission criteria for specific academic programs such as nursing and radiologic technology. These criteria are published on departmental websites as well as college catalogs.

All the colleges advise students on the pathways to complete degrees, certificates and transfer goals in various ways. While all the colleges rely primarily on counselors to advise students on these pathways, other resources are relied upon, including transfer and career centers and a number of support services and programs such as First Year Experience, Honors, Puente, and MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement).

The information on degree, certificate, and transfer programs is published in the college catalogs and various websites. Two colleges noted that improvement was needed in this area. In addition, the information provided by one of the colleges was not adequate enough to assess this component of the Standard. There is no District involvement in developing, publishing, or advising students on degree, certificate, or transfer pathways.

In terms of LACC, the College adheres to outlined admission policies that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. The College does outline pathways in the sense that degree/certificate requirements are made available to students via the catalog and a variety of program specific materials. LACC recently filled a seven-month vacant counseling position that serves as the Articulation Officer. (Standard II.C.6).

LACC appropriately utilizes CCCApply and State Chancellor approved placement instruments. The College recently adjusted its practice regarding the requirement to have an appointment to complete the Assessment instruments. LACC was ranked 8 out of 9 in LACCD for the number of students completing math and English assessment. After adding Drop-In Assessment services, LACC is now ranked 2 out 9 in the number of students completing math and English assessment. (Standard II.C.7).

The Los Angeles Community College District has policies in place for the maintenance and destruction of confidential student records in accordance with state and federal law. The colleges do not use social security numbers (SSN) as the key to records; students are assigned student identification numbers. Electronic records are stored securely in the District student information system, and files are routinely backed up and stored off site. Access to confidential student records by employees is controlled through security where users are assigned passwords based upon their job classification and approval of their supervisor. The District general counsel provides workshops on the confidentiality, security, and maintenance of student records for admissions and records staff. Students can access their electronic records online. Access to student records in person requires a picture identification from the student.

Various paper records are maintained on the campuses in locked files, with access controlled by the supervisor of that office. Some paper records are scanned (imaged) into an online database (product varies by college) and stored on a protected server. The information on the servers is backed up locally and is the responsibility of the college. The student health centers comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) and maintain records in an electronic records system via a contracted service.

The District has a policy for classification of records in accordance with state law as well as destruction of student records based upon the classification system. The colleges publish and follow policies for release of confidential student records that align with current federal and state law. The security and maintenance of student records is a shared responsibility between the District and colleges, with the District having primary responsibility for the records in the Student Information System (DEC)

In terms of LACC, the College has developed and implemented sufficient policies and procedures for the recording and secure storage of student records, including student discipline records. All physical documents in Admissions and Records and Financial Aid are scanned through WebXtender and stored online on a protected server. After one year, the physical documents are shredded. Files created in the Counseling Department on the electronic student education plan software, ActionPlanIt, are stored on a protected server. The College uses the DEC to review transcripts, pre-requisites, and assessment scores, which are only accessible to appropriate full-time classified staff and faculty. (Standard II.C.8).

LACC continues to expand the available student services to Distance Education students. Existing student support services are limited in scope and availability. The Counseling Department currently offers 3 hours per week of “online counseling;” however, the service is offered asynchronously with students having to wait sometimes 72 hours or more to receive a response. When asked how the counseling department derived at offering 3 hours of online service, we found that the service was not based on any metric, only the willingness of a counselor to provide the service for that amount of time. The Counseling Department also offers “Online Chat” for DE students. The availability of this service is also limited to 2 hours a week, one day a week. The College does provide the opportunity for online students to participate in student grievance process via distance education. The College is currently piloting a new online tutoring (NetTutor) service with English students and has plans to expand the services in Fall 2016 to a wider Distance Education audience. It will be

important for the College to use the collected distance education assessment data (ST1B-109) as it proceeds with development of a dedicated support system for Distance Education students. SUO and SLO assessment information is not currently disaggregated in any way that provides information to improve online student services. LACC does not offer any assessment instrument in an online format (Standards II.C.1, II.C.2, II.C.3., II.C.4, II.C.5, II.C.6, II.C.7).

Conclusions

The College meets this Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

The Los Angeles Community College District meets the Standard. The District has adopted, and adheres to, admission policies that are consistent with its mission. These policies include criteria for special categories of students such as concurrent high school enrollment and F-1 students. These policies are published in District and college publications and websites. The District does not have a role in defining and/or advising on clear pathways to degree or certificate completion or transfer. The District and colleges have high standards for the confidentiality, maintenance, release, and destruction of student records that adhere to state and federal law. Staff receives training on the confidentiality of student records, and passwords are routinely changed every 90 days. The databases are backed up nightly and stored in an off-campus location. The campuses also have local databases that store student records. These databases are backed up, although the storage varies.

STANDARD III

RESOURCES

Standard III.A. – Human Resources

General Observations

Los Angeles City College effectively uses its human, physical, technological, and financial resources to achieve its mission, student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Hiring of sufficient numbers of staff, administrators and full-time faculty is coordinated between the District Human Resources operation, the LACCD Personnel Commission, and College staff. Job descriptions of all positions contain relevant criteria for performance of the respective positions. In the case of faculty, assessment of Student Learning Outcomes is included in all faculty job descriptions. Hiring for all employee groups are based upon qualifications including education, training, and relevant experience and follow clearly defined hiring procedures for each respective employee group. The College ensures effective human resources via systematic and continuous evaluation and through the development of policies and procedures, which are reflective of a commitment to equity and diversity. Professional development is offered and supported in alignment with the College mission and teaching and learning needs. Human resources planning occurs in coordination with other college planning processes linking to institution and strategic plan goals. Practices are shared by District Human Resources, the Personnel Commission, and College and will be delineated in the following discussion.

The human resources function at Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) includes both a Human Resource (HR) Division and a Personnel Commission (PC). While both entities are co-located in the District's Educational Services Center (ESC) office building, the authorities and functions are separate. These two entities provide comprehensive human resource services in support of LACCD's employment practices and in adherence to adopted hiring policies to meet the instructional and support needs of the colleges and District.

LACCD's classified staff employment processes are administered by the PC, an autonomously governed merit system organization. The PC is responsible for recruitment and testing for classified staff and management vacancies, audit of assignments, and classification for support staff. The PC also acts as the hearing panel in disciplinary hearing matters affecting classified employees.

The HR Division has oversight for employment operations, employee relations, and professional development activities for faculty, management, and classified employees. The hiring of tenure-track faculty and management personnel is overseen by District Office HR personnel. The hiring process for adjunct faculty is decentralized to the individual colleges, with final qualification and eligibility determinations made by the HR Division.

Findings and Evidence

Los Angeles City College hires and evaluates qualified personnel regularly. LACC relies upon Board Rules and clearly defined procedures to inform the process of hiring highly qualified administrators, faculty, and staff. The policies, regulations, and procedures are posted on the district website and were found by the evaluation team to support such practice. The Board Rules comply with Board of Governors policies and union contracts. Hiring needs are identified by LACC through their integrated planning and governance processes. Prioritization of faculty positions is made by the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) and classified positions are prioritized in concert with the Classified Staff Prioritization Policy. All positions recommended for hire align with unit planning objectives and are documented through the Resource Allocation Requests process. All positions are ultimately approved by the LACCD Board of Trustees. The College works cooperatively with the District Office of Human Resources department to carry out fair and effective recruitment and hiring.

In terms of District operations, the LACCD Board of Trustees, in its role as the governing authority, establishes policies pertaining to the faculty, staff, and administrators employed by the District. These policies, procedures, and related supporting documentation are found on the District's website. The District's HR Division and PC are responsible for the oversight in the hiring of qualified personnel to serve its nine colleges and central District support services, including the selection, evaluation, and monitoring processes within the LACCD. District guidelines provide consistency in the development, definition, and establishment of hiring policies and processes for administrators, full-time faculty, and classified staff. Job descriptions for full-time/regular positions reflect the duties, responsibilities, and authority in support of mission and goals for the college and the District.

Due to the dynamic staffing needs encountered at the college level, decentralization of the recruitment and selection process for part-time/adjunct faculty was implemented. The District's HR department verifies the qualifications of recommended part-time/adjunct faculty prior to hire. HR R-130, entitled "Adjunct Faculty Selection and Pay," requires the president and Academic Senate at each college to develop written procedures governing the search and selection of adjunct faculty to ensure that a thorough and deliberate search for the most qualified candidate is conducted well in advance of the starting date of the assignment. Procedures and processes for the selection of part-time/adjunct faculty are not clearly and publicly stated. College-level adjunct hiring processes result in inconsistent notification and advertisement of employment opportunities. HR reviews part-time/adjunct qualifications upon receipt of candidates from the colleges. Candidates' qualifications are evaluated and verified as meeting the job description requirements. (Standard III.A.1).

The District Office of Human Resources develops and maintains appropriate job descriptions and qualifications for advertised positions reflect the mission by addressing duties, responsibility, and authority. The Personnel Commission ensures candidates meet minimum qualifications for classified positions. Hiring panels include a trained, non-voting Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) officer and training is provided to all selection committee members. The College president then makes a recommendation regarding hiring to the LACCD Board of Trustees. Faculty job announcements include required knowledge of the subject matter to be performed, effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to

contribute to the College mission. The process for assigning distance education courses requires instructor certification via the Etudes DE program. Faculty undergoes evaluation by the DE Committee to determine their qualifications to teach DE courses. The District has a process to review equivalencies of degrees from non-United States institutions.

Faculty qualifications are clearly stated on job descriptions, including education, skills, experience, and/or certifications. Job descriptions include professional responsibilities beyond teaching expectations. Student learning outcomes, curriculum development, and college-level committee requirements are included in responsibility expectations when developing full-time faculty job descriptions. HR reviews the draft job descriptions for competencies, compliance and consistency. Faculty candidates are required to meet all published job qualifications. A faculty-led process for determining equivalency for stated qualifications exists, but is generally limited in utilization. Faculty performance evaluations include the assessment of multiple measures of these job-related requirements. (Standard III.A.2., ER 14).

Job descriptions for administrators and other positions supporting institutional effectiveness and academic quality include requisite education and experience requirements. Job descriptions are updated by HR and the PC to include evolving institutional responsibilities. HR and PC personnel verify candidate qualifications prior to employment consideration. (Standard III.A.3).

LACCD has established policies and procedures regarding the evaluation of educational degrees earned by faculty, administrators, and support personnel. Applicants and employees seeking promotional opportunities are required to submit official transcripts from accredited institutions. Degrees earned from non-U.S. institutions are required to be evaluated by an established state-recognized evaluation organization for equivalency. (Standard III.A.4).

LACC has policies and regulations for the regular evaluation of all administrators, faculty, and classified staff. Evaluation procedures adhere to idiosyncrasies of each constituent group and union as appropriate. Policies, regulations, and associated forms were reviewed by the evaluation team and found to support effective practice in this area. All tenured and probationary full-time faculty, are evaluated by peers, the supervisor, and students. Confidential, secure personnel files maintained in Human Resources contain the evaluation results, once forwarded by the College president. Managers evaluate supervisory and confidential employees at least once every three years, and administrators are evaluated by immediate supervisors at least once every three years.

The District has established a system of performance evaluation for faculty, staff, and administrative personnel. The evaluation process is dictated by individual collective bargaining agreements and District policy. Faculty evaluation tracking is delegated to individual colleges. The PC distributes evaluation notices to classified employees and their respective supervisor during the employee's probationary period. Thereafter, HR uses an automated system to notify supervisors of upcoming and past-due performance evaluations. Current District wide completion rates average approximately 50 percent. (Standard III.A.5).

The College addresses support of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment. The College has an SLO Coordinator, a faculty member with full-time release, is responsible for

ensuring the sustainability of the SLO process to improve teaching and learning. All academic personnel have a written job statement that requires participation in the assessment of SLO's. Faculty engage in the writing of SLO's which must be included in the course syllabi. The actual evaluation forms make explicit reference to participation in the SLO assessment process. Academic administrators have written annual goals, which include SLO objectives.

Faculty evaluations include the assessment of learning outcomes. The negotiated evaluation process and related forms include requirements for the utilization of learning outcomes in the improvement of teaching and learning. Academic administrators' evaluations do not include the assessment of responsibilities related to learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.6).

LACC hires an appropriate number of highly qualified faculty, staff, and administrators to support the College mission and purposes. Hiring of full-time faculty follows California Ed Code and Title 5 regulations and is based upon the Board of Governors set Faculty Obligation Number. The hiring of faculty is guided by the faculty obligation number (FON). To meet the FON objective, the Hiring Prioritization Committee has a defined process that includes hiring of faculty to meet the Educational and Strategic Master Plan. (Standard III.A.7, ER14).

The team confirmed that a breadth of opportunities is provided to orient, evaluate, and guide professional development of adjunct faculty. An orientation program is in place that includes a review of the Faculty Handbook. A Faculty Symposium is in place for all faculty with specific sessions for adjunct faculty. Evaluation of adjunct faculty is the same as for full-time faculty and includes evaluation of participation in the assessment of SLO's.

LACCD employs a substantial cadre of over 3,300 part-time/adjunct faculty among the nine colleges and academic organizations. Each college is delegated the responsibility for orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development of adjunct faculty at their respective campus. Opportunities for part-time faculty participation in the teaching and learning aspects of college operations and decision-making are provided and encouraged. (Standard III.A.8).

The primary way to identify human resource needs for staff positions at LACC is the Program Review and Resource Allocation Request process. A new process is defined for 2016-2017 whereby the Classified Hiring Prioritization subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) will assess the classified staff prioritization process. The assessment will ensure that hiring of classified positions supports the goals documented in the ESMP and program reviews. (Standard III.A.9, ER 8).

Administrative positions consist of academic and classified managers and supervisors. Funding is allocated to all colleges in the District to support administrative positions based on FTES. LACC has staffing consistent with colleges of similar sizes within the District. The allocation of academic administrators is defined in the District's Final Budget Allocation Mechanism in the annual adopted budget. The District Office of Human Resources ensures academic administrators meet minimum qualifications for their respective positions. (Standard III.A.10).

Written personnel policies and procedures are available online for information and review. A process of regular policy review and updating has been established. The Human Resource Council meets monthly to review and recommend proposed changes in Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. The HR Council's membership includes college presidents, the vice chancellor of HR, college vice presidents (academic affairs, student services, and administrative services), and resource personnel, as needed. The PC regularly reviews its policies and procedures regarding the employment of classified staff. These rules and regulations provide fair and equitable employment conditions. The Employment Relations Department is responsible for addressing allegations of inconsistent application of District policies.

A review of the written policies and procedures for all positions posted on their District's website has validated the existence of distinct written procedures for hiring of all personnel. The College works in concert with the District Office of Human Resources and the District Personnel Commission to ensure adherence to the California Education Code. All personnel policies and regulations are posted online as are all collective bargaining agreements. Detailed information is provided for the evaluation of all respective employee groups. (Standard III.A.11).

The Office of Diversity Programs provides programs, analysis, and training to support the District's diverse personnel. This office is assigned compliance and investigatory responsibilities to resolve allegations of unlawful discrimination and conduct. LACCD's "Project Match" program provides a formalized outreach program to aspiring, but historically underrepresented, individuals to encourage community college faculty careers. An Equal Employment Opportunity Plan has been adopted and includes an annual evaluation of employment equity and diversity of LACCD's employees. (Standard III.A.12).

The District has adopted Board policy, Code of Ethics-Board Rule #1204, and collectively bargained language addressing professional ethics expectations. Appropriate corrective actions and consequences are addressed in the Board Rule. (Standard III.A.13).

The District has long-established professional development programs. Existing programs and new opportunities for District employees are continually identified, evaluated, and developed, i.e., "Dean's Academy," "Professional Development College," and "The President's Academy." The introduction of a partnership with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) to create the "President's Academy" provides relevant training for aspiring LACCD executive leaders. The District Academic Senate provides faculty representatives the ability to work collaboratively in providing content in support of student learning and success. The District also explores methods to increase opportunities for its classified staff. Campus-level trainings are provided by District personnel as part of the regular communication and educational support. (Standard III.A.14).

The District provides security and has established both physical and electronic access safeguards in the confidentiality of personnel and employment records. Access to confidential electronic personnel data is monitored and limited to authorized employees. Procedures, as evidenced by Administrative Regulation C-10, Custodian of District Records,

and collective bargaining agreement language are in place to provide employee access to his/her personnel records. (Standard III.A.15).

Conclusion

The LACCD provides comprehensive human resource services to employ qualified personnel in support of its broad educational programs. The District has established policies and procedures beginning with the recruitment process, hiring, evaluation, and employee-related matters throughout employment for its regular employees.

Although the colleges currently are responsible for the adjunct faculty hiring process, the District is responsible to assure that employment policies and practices are clearly described and equitably administered. However, the recruitment and employment of adjunct faculty is unevenly administered, and, therefore, the District does not meet Standard III.A.1.

The District does not conduct regular evaluations of all staff, and does not meet Standard III.A.5.

Faculty evaluations include an assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as a component of the performance appraisal; however, academic administrators' evaluations do not have an SLO responsibility component, so the District does not meet Standard III.A.6. The team commends the District for its commitment to professional development and improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of its employees in support of student achievement.

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure consistent and uniform guidelines for the search and selection of adjunct faculty. (Standard III.A.1).

District Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure all personnel are systematically evaluated at stated intervals in accordance with the bargaining agreements and Board policies. (Standard III.A.5).

District Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District update the performance evaluations of academic administrators to include the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. (Standard III.A.6).

The College does not meet the Standard due to compliance matters related to Standards III.A.1, III.A.5, III.A.6 as described above.

Standard III.B. – Physical Resources

General Observations

As part of the Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles City College offers programs and services at the college campus with dual enrollment courses at local high schools and other community based locations. The College and the District continue to benefit from three General Obligation Bonds (Measures A, AA and J), which led to the construction and modernization of buildings. These efforts were visible at the time of the site visit as some buildings were in the construction and modernization process. The College relies on state funds for deferred and scheduled maintenance, when available. A specific allocation exists from the District to each college for Physical Plant and Instructional Equipment and Library Materials funds.

The District's role and performance is, for the most part, strong and effective in assisting the college in meeting Accreditation Standards. Three District documents (the Independent Review Panel Report dated January 4, 2012, resulting in 17 recommendations to the chancellor for the improvement of the bond program delivery; the LACCD Comprehensive Plan for Total Cost of Ownership dated March 20, 2013, resulting in seven recommendations for the better understanding of the actual cost associated with maintaining and operating a building; and the LACCD Accreditation Special Report, dated April 1, 2013, that responded specifically to the 17 recommendations to the Independent Review Panel Report) indicate the District's commitment to ensuring that integrity and accountability are maintained in the acquisition, implementation, and use of funds related to the physical resources of the District.

Findings and Evidence

The District plays a significant role in ensuring that all locations under its purview are safe and that sufficient resources are provided to maintain each facility. The LACCD contracts with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department for college campus security. This agreement provides for a standardized and coordinated approach to campus safety. Further, a report titled Blue Ribbon Panel on Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness was adopted December 16, 2015. The charge of the panel was to, "review the District's existing policies and procedures on safety and security in order to determine the readiness of the colleges, District satellites and the Educational Service Center in cases of natural catastrophes or criminal events." It will be critical to follow up on the progress of the colleges and District in their response to the recommendations and implementation of plans. The sufficiency of physical resources at the colleges is clearly assured by the District. Three bond issues have been passed since 2001 resulting in nearly \$6.2 billion in capital project funding. To date, about 80 percent of those funds have been expended. All funds are budgeted to projects. Sufficiency is also evident by the current cap load status. District wide, the lecture capacity/load ratio is 162 percent while the laboratory cap/load is at 144 percent. The District has supported the colleges in assuring access. ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) transition plans were created for the nine colleges using District resources. The implementation of the plan is funded by a District wide bond allocation of almost \$69 million.

In terms of LACC, the College utilizes constituent surveys, including student surveys, to evaluate campus safety. The visiting team verified and reviewed documented emergency plans and procedures. All emergency plans are provided directly to management staff and regularly distributed to the campus community. All plans are available online to the public and campus community. The College regularly provides training for response to earthquake, fire, and active shooter scenarios. Emergency procedures are documented on the Emergency Procedures website. The team reviewed evidence of on-going safety training provided to the campus community. The College maintains a variety of methods for emergency notifications to include a building captain and floor warden assigned to all buildings. Blackboard Connect is utilized for mass messaging in the event of emergency and Blue Light talk-a-phone systems are located in some of the parking lots, with more planned in future building projects. Physical security is provided via a contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The Sheriff's department provides patrol, video monitoring, and escort services. (Standard III.B.1).

The District provides effective centralized services for planning, acquiring, building, maintaining and upgrading its physical resources. Following the 17 recommendations in the Independent Review Panel Report, the District has developed a new program management approach assuring the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services to achieve its mission. Noting that shared governance practices had significantly contributed to increased costs, changes, delays, and disruptions to the Building Program, the Board responded with BT4: Resolution-Standardize Centralized Accountability Controls dated September 12, 2012. The resolution centralized accountability measures and established that college project managers report through the program manager to the District. The District uses a "project allocation model" in dispensing bond funds which ensures that the Board of Trustees has primary control over which projects will be built at the colleges and that projects will align with District priorities, i.e., support of the Educational Master Plan ensuring a consistency of intent. To ensure the model is followed, Board Resolution to Adopt a Master Budget Plan and to Implement Policies to Strengthen Oversight and Spending Practices for the District's Construction Program (BT6) was approved by the Board on October 5, 2011.

For the College, the planning of facilities is implemented in concert with several plans. College construction is documented in the facilities master plan and has primarily been funded through bond construction funds, as outlined in the District's Bond Master Plan. College representatives are included in District facilities and construction planning. The College uses the Educational and Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) and the Facilities Master plan for effective utilization of space. Maintenance projects are funded through State funds for deferred and scheduled maintenance. These projects are completed by the College Facilities team. The College has documented a plan in the ESMP to meet specific staffing levels that is supported by District funding. (Standard III.B.2).

The District materially assists the colleges in updating master facilities plans on a regular basis. This planning is managed through the bond program manager reporting to the District Office. The BuildLACCD website shows evidence that all nine colleges have current facility master plans, the oldest being less than eight years old. Further, the District assists the

colleges in facility condition assessment and uses the data to identify needs and allocate District-scheduled maintenance funds.

The College relies on data from the Facilities Utilization and Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) annual reports to assess the effective utilization of space. In addition to FUSION, the College utilizes the integrated planning process to align facilities with the ESMP. Data is evaluated from the campus climate surveys, student surveys, the College Administrative Services survey, and the CMMS (maintenance work order system) to improve facilities. Campus climate surveys are utilized to assess campus safety and to improve the healthful learning and working environment. (Standard III.B.3).

The Board of Trustees adopted the Master Building Program Budget Plan per resolution BT6 dated October 5, 2011. The plan assigns budgets at the individual project level providing support for long-range capital plans. The Board adopted Resolution 3 of BT6 dated October 5, 2011, stating, "The chancellor ... will include in the regular budget reports the identification of funding measures to address the costs of maintaining and operating expanded facilities." Following that, the District produced the Comprehensive Plan for Total Cost of Ownership detailing seven points defining, "a process for establishing the true cost of additional space." The Board voted to create a Deferred Maintenance Fund by passing Board Resolution BT2 on May 23, 2012. This resolution sets aside a fixed amount each year from the General Fund to address postponed and emergency repairs and maintenance work not funded by the bond program. In addition, the District provides funding to the colleges for maintenance and operations calculated by a formula that takes into consideration total assignable square footage as a part of the basic allocation. (Standard III.B.4).

Conclusion

In general, the role of the District in supporting the colleges to meet the Standards of Accreditation is evident and well supported. The District has implemented positive changes to the bond program management structure and adequately responded to the recommendations made in the Independent Review Panel Report.

The College meets this Standard.

Standard III.C. – Technology Resources

General Observations

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) emphasizes the effective use of technology in the support of teaching and learning, student support and success, and administrative functions to assist students and staff as evidenced by the significant investment made in staff to support the use of technology, equipment and systems, and training of staff and students in the use of technology. The forty-plus members of the LACCD Information Technology department provide systems and services to support learning, assessment, and teaching with infrastructure and productivity tools as outlined in the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan-Vision 2020. Campus information technology staff at each of the nine campuses assist in the delivery of LACCD Information Technology department systems and services as well as support the classroom, computer labs, and local infrastructure to enhance the learning environment. Policy, planning, and budget recommendations regarding the use of technology across LACCD is driven by the Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC) which is a governance committee with representation from all constituents. The District Technology Committee (DTC) focuses on operational decisions and makes recommendations to the TPPC.

Los Angeles City College provides technology services and resources to support learning, teaching, communication, research, and administrative operations. Planning for technology is incorporated into the integrated planning process at both the College and District levels. Technology services have been developed to support the effectiveness of the institution in implementing available technologies to support the teaching and learning process and College operations.

Findings and Evidence

Technology resources are used to support student learning, student services, and institutional effectiveness. As noted in the District/College Functional Map, this is a shared responsibility between the colleges and the District. Each college technology department provides support and infrastructure to meet campus network and computing needs. At the District level, the LACCD Information Technology department provides the wide area network infrastructure, an enterprise resource planning system for finance and human resources (SAP), a student information system (DEC/PeopleSoft), an educational planning system (DegreeWorks), email for students and staff (Office 365/Microsoft Exchange), a helpdesk ticketing system (CMMS), a scheduling system for faculty class and room assignments (Protocol ESS), an electronic curriculum development system (ECD), and other related systems as presented in the campus Self Evaluation Reports and confirmed in interviews with District and college technology staff. In addition, it was noted in interviews with campus technology managers that LACCD Information Technology assists with contract optimization, District wide technology standards, best practices, data interface to campus specific systems such as distance education systems and staff augmentations when needed to assist the colleges.

The College provides technology to its students, faculty, and staff through over 2000 computers accessible to students and 864 for faculty and staff. Students are provided access to 73 labs that are staffed by College personnel. The library provides labs open to all

students. Software is provided to all students and staff via Office 365 with email. Employees are provided Microsoft Office and Adobe Suite. Support for the above is provided by the College Information Technology Services Staff.

The District's bond dollars have supported significant improvement in technology infrastructure for the College. The College has input on all Information Technology (IT) Bond projects and serves as a resource on the Bond Steering Committee. The Bond has specifically supported network storage, high-end servers, and virtual software. To assess technology needs, the College relies on its inventory, surveys to students and staff, and work order reports.

The Technology Services Committee is the governance body responsible for evaluating technology and ensures technology goals are met in the ESMP. The committee has responsibility for developing the Technology Resources Plan and assessing trends and resource levels.

Technology infrastructure is in place to maintain the College's DE programs. The College ensures internet connectivity through reliability contracts and has a contract in place for the teaching and learning platform. (Standard III.C.1).

Planning at the District level is defined in the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan-Vision 2020. The plan was developed with input from all nine campuses by the District Technology Planning Taskforce (DTPT). As stated in the plan, this task force was commissioned by the TPPC and comprised faculty from each of the nine colleges, administrative leadership and students. The DTPT developed the plan as a framework for the District and identified five areas to achieve the mission, including learning, assessment, teaching, infrastructure, and productivity. The plan is reviewed regularly at TPPC meetings as evidenced by the committee minutes. In interviews with District staff, it was noted that the five-year re-assessment, due in 2016, of the current state of IT infrastructure at all the colleges and the District will be done in the next four to six months. This will be used to update the target baseline for all colleges in the technology areas identified in the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan-Vision 2020. Two of the campus technology plans indicate direct alignment with Vision 2020 and the other seven technology plans are directly aligned with their respective campus strategic plans which identify Vision 2020 as a guiding force. Further, the TPPC commissioned the Implementation Task Force (ITF) with representation from faculty, administrative leadership, represented staff, and students which developed thirty two objectives to work on for the next five years. This was approved by the TPPC in 2013. Some colleges are incorporating Total Cost of Ownership principles, but some have not. As identified in the District/College Functional Map this is a shared responsibility between the colleges and the District.

The College utilizes several documented plans to inform its technology needs. These plans are all components of the documented/published integrated planning process. The ESMP specifically identifies supporting technology necessary to support student learning. The Technology Resources Plan includes action plans to support the ESMP and replacement of technology is documented in the program review process. The Technology Steering Committee completes annual assessment of the Technology Resource Plan. Ultimately, the

College integrated planning process relating to technology aligns with the District's technology plan (the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan Vision 2020). (Standard III.C.2).

Reliable, safe, and secure technology resources are the primary responsibility of the colleges and a shared responsibility with the District. Through interviews, the team determined that the LACCD Information Technology department has developed Disaster Recover/Business Continuity plans which include local backup to disk, immediate backup to a second data center at one of the college sites about 25 kilometers away, with a final encrypted copy to tape. The tapes are moved off site to a specialized tape vault service, and the tapes are rotated out of state to Nevada for greater protection. Each campus is responsible for the security and reliability of the systems and data they support locally. All nine colleges indicate varying levels of security for locally supported systems, with six doing local campus backup only, two having local backups at a second on-campus data center, and one college doing backup to the District. None of the colleges indicate the existence of a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan in their respective Institution Self Evaluation Reports. Interviews with campus and District technology staff confirmed that student and staff data are stored both at the District and campus servers and should be protected.

The College utilizes ad Help Desk to address technology issues. The College IT Department completed over 1,500 work requests related to technology issues. In addition to daily work order responses, the College maintains support contracts for all systems including phone, MS systems, technology security, and its enterprise systems for student learning.

Physical security for college data is secured in the Administration Building. Access to the data center is limited to IT staff and senior administrators. Virtual security is ensured by Palo Alto Next Generation Firewall, and the College provides layers of security controls. (Standard III.C.3).

Support, including training, in the effective use of technology is the primary responsibility of the colleges. Each campus has the appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators for their respective systems as evidenced by the existence of various forms of teaching and learning centers on the campus as well as training opportunities. As confirmed by interviews with District and campus technology staff, training is scheduled as part of any new systems deployment. The established strategy is to create super-users for all District wide systems so that the local campus can maintain the training after initial system deployment. The District will also schedule trainings on an as-requested basis when a significant need is identified. Campus technology staff also indicates that the District Information Technology unit provides funds for off-site training in deployed technology solutions.

The College provides a breadth of technology training to faculty, staff, and students. The Teaching Learning Center (TLC) provides training to all employees. Student training for technology is provided through the Library, the OSS High Tech Lab, and a variety of academic programs. Staffing is provided to support student labs. Student surveys indicate a majority of students are satisfied with the number of labs provided on campus. (Standard III.C.4).

Policies and administrative regulations in place at the District which guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning process include B-27 Network Security Policy, B-28 Use of District and College Computing Facilities, B-33 Web Accessibility Standards and Guidelines, B-34 ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan, E-89 Distance Education Policy, E-105 Student Privacy/FERPA, and E-114 Identity Theft Prevention Program. The colleges acknowledge that they abide by these policies to guide operations as evidenced in their respective Institution Self Evaluation Reports. The team confirmed in interviews that the TPPC and TPC suggest policies as needed to aid in the appropriate use of the technology. In addition, the colleges have additional local policies for campus technologies such as websites and distance education systems. (Standard III.C.5).

Conclusion

The College does not meet the Standard due to compliance matters related to Standards III.C.3 as described below.

Technology resources are adequate to support the institution's management and operational functions. Tremendous effort has been put into integrated planning within each college and is guided by planning processes District wide. The institution plans for District-level technology replacement using a Total Cost of Ownership model for District systems. Sound decisions about technology are being made as a result. None of the colleges acknowledge a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan although all indicate redundancy on campus data centers and local backups. The District and campuses provide appropriate instruction and support in the effective use of technology solutions. The District has appropriate policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in teaching and learning processes. The District meets all the Standards in III.C except Standard III.C.3.

The team commends the technology staff from the nine colleges and the District for their teamwork and collaboration in sharing staff resources, developing technology standards, collaborative training, and deployment of integrated systems which result in effective and efficient use of technology resources to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.4).

District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District and colleges develop a comprehensive business continuity/disaster recovery plan to ensure reliable access, safety, and security. (Standard III.C.3).

Standard III.D. – Financial Resources

General Observations

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) has strong fiscal practices as evidenced by the reports from the District's external auditors, strong reserves, and documented practices in place to help achieve the District's goals of Organizational Effectiveness and Resources and Collaboration. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Treasurer serves as the executive head which oversees all financial operations, including directing the development of financial strategies, policies, programs, models, controls, and standards to ensure the financial integrity and performance of the colleges, and also supports the overall strategic missions of the District. The CFO also monitors the effectiveness of the Board-approved budget allocation mechanisms and plans, develops, directs, and evaluates the District's treasury that includes cash and investment management. The CFO manages and directs the following departments: 1) Budget and Management Analysis; 2) Accounting; 3) Central Financial Aid; and 4) Office of Internal Audit.

Under the direction of the CFO, there are 91 staff members who provide services to the colleges. Staffing includes six staff members within the CFO Office. In the Budget and Management Analysis department, eight staff provide direction to the colleges on budget development, budget monitoring, and analysis of budget activity; in Accounting, 57 staff are responsible for general accounting, accounts payable, and payroll; in Central Financial Aid, 13 staff ensure all student aid programs are in compliance; and seven staff in the Office of Internal Audit provide investigations and internal control improvements.

The District's main budget committee is the District Budget Committee (DBC), a District-level governance committee comprised of the nine college presidents, six Academic Senate representatives, six Faculty Guild representatives, and one representative from each of the following: AFT (American Federation of Teachers) Staff Guild, Local 911 Teamster, EEIU Local 99, Building and Construction Trades, Supervisors Local 721, Classified Management, and Associated Students Organization. This committee also includes the deputy chancellor, chief financial officer, and budget director as resource personnel. The DBC reports to both the chancellor and all constituent groups, and is charged with formulating recommendations to the chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District's Strategic Plan; reviewing the District's budget; making recommendations to the chancellor for adoption or modifications; and reviewing the District's financial condition on a quarterly basis.

The chancellor (ex-officio), the CFO (chair), four Academic Senate/faculty representatives, one union/association representative, two college presidents, two college vice presidents, and the deputy chancellor serve on the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (EDBC). The purpose of the committee is to advise the chancellor on financial matters, evaluate the District Budget Committee, manage the District Budget Committee agenda, and perform as a workgroup on fiscal matters.

Beginning in April 2016, a new vice chancellor of finance and resource development will begin tenure and will hire a new director, institutional advancement. The latter, new position will focus on resource and workforce development. There will be no significant changes to

the responsibilities of current staff except for the addition of one reporting layer between the chief financial officer and chancellor.

LACC has a defined budget allocation model referred to as the Final Budget Allocation Mechanism documented in the District's annual adopted budget. The model provides measurable fiscal accountability, well-managed financial resources and reserves, and a transparent financial management culture that demonstrates integrity and fiscal stability. The management of annual apportionment, other state and categorical revenues, COLA appropriations, and the budget stabilization fund provides a strong level of assurance and expectation for both short- and long-term fiscal solvency.

The allocation model is relatively easy to understand. The allocation is predictable in that it provides a minimum base allocation for apportionment, certain staffing allocations, and allocations for maintenance of colleges. While the allocation of revenues from the District is the primary revenue support, the College actively seeks its own revenues from other sources such as facilities rentals and industry partnerships.

The College has had a relatively stable budget over the course of the last four years, generating a surplus in the College fund balance. In the 2014-2015 fiscal year, the college over-estimated FTES generation and subsequently ended the year with a deficit. Board Policy dictates repayment to the District for the deficit and the College has developed a written plan to address the deficit. The visiting team reviewed the written plan to ensure its existence and ensured it has been submitted to the District fiscal operations.

Within the College, the allocation and planning for financial resources is included in the integrated planning process. The ESMP serves as the primary document for program and financial planning. The Budget Committee recommends budget priorities annually to the College Council, which ensures that they are in line with the college mission and long-term priorities of the college and tracks budget performance against ESMP goals. Resource requests are made through the program review process whereby units must document unit-planning objectives linked to the ESMP. Program resource requests are reviewed by the Budget Committee against a defined rubric. Recommendations for funding are forwarded to the College Council for review and recommendation to the College President.

Findings and Evidence

In October 2013, the Board of Trustees adopted the District Financial Accountability Measures in response to a 2013 Accreditation Evaluation Report for Los Angeles Valley College, which recommended that accountability measures be put in place to ensure long-term fiscal stability and financial integrity of the college. The District Financial Accountability Measures are used to ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of all colleges within the District and require that each college president include provisions for (1) a balanced budget; (2) long-term enrollment plans; (3) position control for personnel; (4) an annual financial plan; (5) quarterly reporting on expenditures and overall fiscal status; (6) a college reserve policy; and (7) action plans.

Financial planning at LACC is documented and followed as a significant component of the College's integrated planning process. Annual budget priorities are developed by the LACC

Planning and Budget Committee based on the College's mission and its Educational and Strategic Plan goals. Priorities are next reviewed and approved at the College Council. Recommendations from the Council are forwarded to the President for consideration.

LACC has a well-organized and documented process by which it involves all constituency representation in the planning and budgeting process. Department needs are assessed and prioritized through the program and unit review process and filtered up through the Planning and Budget committee, the President's Cabinet, and College Council. The evaluation team conducted on site interviews and observations to confirm this assessment. The College utilizes program review processes, vacant, and new positions to support programmatic enhancement. Funding of program enhancements effectively traverses the integrated planning process. While budget planning process are integrated, actual FTES earned in the 2014-2015 fiscal year did not meet projections. Pursuant to Board Policy, the College has an outstanding payment due to the District. Repayment of funds to the District may inhibit enhancement of teaching and learning in the future. (Standard III.D.1).

The District's budget planning process is clearly laid out in the District's "Operation Plan Instructions" for 2015-16 (District's website) which covers the budget calendar for the year and detailed instructions on how the budget will be prepared. In reviewing the last three years' final budgets, the team finds that they are well done and contain a very good analysis of the budget in both summary and detailed form. Information is presented at both the District and college levels and includes the general fund as well as the other funds of the District (i.e., bookstore, cafeteria, child development, building, financial aid, special revenue, and debt service funds). The plan includes the chancellor's recommendations on the use of \$57.67 million of State Mandated Reimbursement Revenues and how they were tied to the District's Strategic Plan Goals.

The evaluation team confirmed through review of evidence that financial planning is integrated with institutional planning via the Unit Reviews, Program Review, and Resource Request process for allocation of new or additional resources. Thorough implementation of the integrated planning model ensures that financial planning supports the mission of the College. Resource requests must have a direct connection to department planning and assessment. Financial resource planning is clearly integrated with both the LACC Educational and Strategic Master Plan as defined by the Resource Request process, requirements, and committee approval chain. Financial planning supports other college plans such as Technology Resource Plan, Staff Development Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and others. The College ensures annual assessment of the performance of the budget towards goals in institution-wide plans. (Standard III.D.2, III.D.3).

While the District's Financial Accountability Measures require that the colleges maintain position control for personnel, upon discussion with finance staff, it was noted that the District's information system does not currently have a tool to track and maintain personnel costs. While the District's percentage of salaries and benefits compared to overall expenditures is approximately 85 percent, several of the colleges significantly exceed this amount.

The College demonstrated that it uses strategically analyzed and realistic resource availability assessment and estimates in its planning and allocation processes. The LACC

budget development process is well vetted throughout the College and is integrated with the institutional mission and goals and data driven enrollment estimates. Progress made towards institutional goals are assessed annually. The evaluation team verified the process through interviews and review of evidence. The College fully acknowledges and accounts for long-term financial priorities and liabilities as it develops the annual budget plan and priorities. (Standard III.D.4).

The District has an internal audit department that regularly reviews all business and finance systems to ensure compliance with relevant policies, procedures, laws, and statutory regulations. The Internal Audit Plans for the last three years reflect a focus on cash controls, procurements/contracts, Associate Student organizations, foundations, human resources, special requests, financial aid, and the fraud hotline. Over the last three years the internal audit department averaged 7,500 audit hours per year.

The institution uses its well-established and consistent participatory governance structure to provide regular and timely financial reports and data for both ongoing updates and budget planning purposes. The campus vice president of administrative services also provides frequent written communication in terms of the budget, fiscal conditions, financial planning, and external audit results, disseminated throughout the entire campus community.

Confirmation of appropriate financial documentation and its degree of credibility and accuracy are evidenced in the most recent external auditor's annual report. LACC's annual audits have resulted in unqualified reports related to the financial statements, clean audits with no deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting, and minimal audit findings that are promptly corrected. (Standards III.D.5, III.D.6, III.D.7).

The District has several reserves. Since 2013-14, the District has had a general fund reserve of six and one-half percent of expenditures and other uses, and a contingency reserve of three and one-half percent. Over the last three years, the District has maintained an ending balance over 13 percent. There is also a two percent set aside used to fund deferred maintenance projects, which is sometimes referred to as the Deferred Maintenance Reserve. (Standards III.D.5, III.D.9).

Audit reports are available for review on the District's website and the last three years' reports all included "unmodified" opinions rendered by the District's external auditors, the cleanest opinion an auditor can give. The Management, Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) for the last three years was well done and included a summary of the history of the District, a summary of economic factors, and explanations of changes between current-year and prior-year numbers. There were no "material weaknesses" reported in the audit reports for the years ending June 30, 2013, 2014, and 2015. There was a "significant deficiency" reported in each of the last three years' reports related to information technology controls, and "To Be Arranged" (TBA) hours that have been outstanding since the 2007 fiscal audit. In 2014, the audit report included several recurring significant deficiency findings in the EOPS/CARE programs, but those were cleared in 2015. In the last three years, there have been other findings that are considered significant deficiencies and/or compliance findings, but recent results show the District clearing those findings by the next audit year. (Standards III.D.7) (III.D.10).

The District's audit reports for the bond program are posted on the District's website. There are two separate reports, one for performance audits and the second for financial audits. The performance audit reports (2006-07 through 2013-14) are quite detailed and address such things as analysis of change orders, completeness of operating procedures, and evaluation of the project close-out process. The financial reports (2007-08 through 2014-15) are broken down between Proposition A, Proposition AA and the Measure J bond programs, each with a separate opinion. For the 2014-15 financial report, all three opinions were all unmodified and the results of the auditor tests disclosed no instance of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. For the performance audits, it was noted that there were several substantial improvements over key capital project delivery processes compared to what was found in previous years. There were several areas where additional improvements could be made which included two medium-priority opportunities and three low-priority opportunities. No high-priority opportunities were identified. (Standard III.D.8).

The cash available to the District is sufficient as evidenced by the District not participating in Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) since the 2012-13 year, and the cash balance reported to the State Chancellor's Office in the CCFS-311Q. Over the last three years, the report showed a low of \$51,116,662 and a high of \$262,061,404 for cash balances. (Standard III.D.9).

The District has adequate property and liability coverage in the amounts of \$600 million and \$40 million, respectively. The District's property deductible is \$25,000 per occurrence, and the liability self-insurance retention is \$1.5 million per occurrence. The District is self-insured for Workers' Compensation up to \$750,000 per claim through USI, with excess coverage through Safety National. Because some of the colleges have incurred huge debt to the District, the District Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee has recommended a debt repayment policy. The committee also proposed a plan for future STRS/PERS increases. In the 2015-16 budget, the District set aside \$20 million (later revised to \$22 million) of one-time funds to fund the future obligation for the STRS/PERS increases that will impact the District over the next few years. The District's plans call for using a portion of the \$22 million each year to cover two-thirds of the cost of the increase; this will cover the on-going increase through 2020-21. (Standards III.D.10, III.D.11).

The District has a significant, unfunded liability for retiree healthcare. As of the 2013 actuarial valuation, the liability was estimated at \$478,320,000 and the market value of assets in the District's Irrevocable Trust (PERS) was \$76,800,000, resulting in an unfunded balance of \$401,520,000. The District Annual Required Contribution (ARC) for 2014-15 was \$34,604,000, and the District made contributions of \$29,604,235. At the end of fiscal year 2014-15, the liability was 16.06 percent funded. While there was no official plan to fund the entire OPEB liability, steps have been taken to mitigate the liability. Examples of that include changing the health benefit plan to PERS Medical which reduced the liability by over \$120 million, the creation of the irrevocable trust through CalPERS, and the negotiated settlement with all six collective bargaining groups to take 1.92 percent of COLA in 2006 and apply it toward the ARC. Over the last two years, the District contributed 86 percent of the ARC

payment. At the time of the accreditation visit, the District was waiting for the draft of the 2015 Actuarial Valuation. (Standard III.D.12).

The District’s long-term debt schedule reflects a liability of \$4.3 billion with most of the debt being General Obligation Bonds where debt payment resources will come from taxes on local property. Other long-term debt reported is Workers’ Compensation claims, general liability claims, compensated absences, and capital lease obligations. One liability that is not recorded is for load banking, an option available to faculty as part of the faculty collective bargaining agreement, Article 39. Discussion with District managers confirmed that the colleges have load banking obligations, but a liability has not been booked into the District’s financial statements. District audits reveal no locally incurred debt instruments. (Standards III.D.12, 13, 14).

The District does not have any Certificates of Participation outstanding. Auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grant monitoring are done at each of the colleges, with some oversight from the District. Claims are done through the District’s Accounting Office. For example, the District’s Internal Audit department has spent significant hours auditing the Colleges’ Associated Student Organization funds and college foundations. The District also coordinates the external financial audits for the college foundations. The Los Angeles Community College District Foundation has not had much activity over the last several years. The last audit report was for the years ended June 30, 2012 and 2013; at that time, cash assets were \$328,845. Reviewing the District’s Financial Summary, the cash balance as of February 29, 2016, is \$384,975. There is a Representation Letter with the auditors to do a review of the financial statements for the years ended June, 30, 2014 and 2015. A review is proposed instead of an audit due to the limited activity. (Standard III.D.14).

The District’s Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) 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. The CFAU also assures that the colleges clean up any audit issues as soon as discovered and tracks and makes phone calls to help collect on the Federal Perkins Loan Program. Default rates for the last four years were provided by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

Perkins Default Rates

	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12
LA City	25.35%	22.67%	26.44%	28.00%
East LA	24.53%	18.33%	17.46%	14.52%
LA Harbor	33.33%	37.50%	33.33%	33.33%
LA Mission	10.00%	14.29%	28.57%	41.67%
LA Pierce	33.96%	33.33%	41.67%	35.90%
LA Southwest	31.58%	27.59%	34.00%	34.00%
LA Trade-Tech	36.66%	43.75%	38.54%	21.30%
LA Valley	12.68%	14.29%	12.63%	32.39%

West LA	46.88%	34.48%	39.13%	47.62%
----------------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Four colleges had a Perkins default rate that exceeded 30 percent for three, straight years. Los Angeles Harbor, Los Angeles Pierce, Los Angeles Trade-Technical (LATT), and West Los Angeles had total principal outstanding loans in default that exceeded 240 days in the amount of \$874,202. The District is phasing out the Perkins Loan Program and is moving to the Direct Loan Program. The published default rates for the Direct Loan Program only go through fiscal year 2012. Only one of the nine colleges had rates over 30 percent-LATT at 32.2 percent; however, it has been in the program for only one year. (Standards III.D.10, III.D.15, ER5).

Conclusion

The team commends the District for its substantial support of the internal audit function. The College does not meet the Standard due to compliance matters related to Standards III.D.7, III.D.12, as described above.

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness and better assess financial resource availability, the team recommends that the District implement a District position control system to track and budget for personnel costs. (Standard III.D.4).

District Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District comprehensively responds to the recurring audit findings concerning: 1) the internal control weakness in information technology controls over the areas of security and change management; and 2) the state compliance exceptions related to “To Be Arranged” (TBA) hours attendance documentation and course classifications. (Standard III.D.7).

District Recommendation 7 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District develop and publicize a plan to fully fund the Other Post Employment Benefit (OPEB) Liability, which is currently funded at 16.06 percent. (Standard III.D.12)

District Recommendation 8 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District develop a process to capture the full impact of the District’s liability for load banking and to record the liability in the District’s financial statements. (Standard III.D.12)

College Recommendation 6 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends a full review of the Final Budget Allocation Mechanism as documented in the District’s annual adopted budget. Specifically, the parameters for College Debt Repayment should be reviewed to ensure the College has the ability to achieve its stated mission and sustain its fiscal viability. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3).

STANDARD IV

Standard IV.A. - Leadership and Governance

General Observations

The LACCD has a seven-member Board that presides over nine colleges serving more than 225,000 students. The LACCD Board of Trustees establishes policies that are consistent with its mission statement and exercises oversight of the college's educational programs by means of its Board Rules and Administrative Regulations (Board Rules, Chapter 1, Article 2).

The District supports effective institutional governance through well-established practices which ensure administrators and faculty exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget. The shared governance process is the primary mechanism by which all campus constituents participate in decision-making. Faculty have primary responsibility for curriculum and student learning programs and services, but administrators are appropriately involved in the curriculum process. In some instances, classified staff are not included in the membership of District wide institutional governance committees regarding institutional planning and policies.

The college president executes policies and procedures and presides over the daily operations of the colleges. The college president reports to the chancellor of the District.

Los Angeles City College has a robust participatory governance structure in place with clearly defined decision-making roles and processes that provides opportunities for participation by all constituent groups of the College. College leaders support students, staff, faculty, and administrators in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. There are systematic participative processes and policies for bringing forward ideas and working together towards implementation.

Administrators and faculty have a clearly defined role and exercise this voice with respect to policies, planning, and budgeting prioritization as it relates to their areas of responsibility and expertise. The decision making policies and processes at LACC are aligned with the appropriate expertise and responsibility of faculty, staff, administrators, and students and action is taken in a timely matter related to planning and curriculum. Information about the activities of the various groups that make up the participatory structure is widely available and readily accessible. The use of SharePoint is an effective means of communication between constituent groups at the College.

Findings and Evidence

The District has a culture that encourages participation by all constituencies, described by the chancellor as "The Power of NINE!" in reference to the District's nine colleges. Constituent participation includes the District- and college-level Academic Senate, the six collective bargaining units, the Associated Students, a seven-member Board of Trustees, and District/college management. These constituent bodies have the opportunity to provide input into decision-making as outlined in the *District Governance and Functions Handbook*. The

governance functional map outlines the lines of authority and delineates the colleges and District roles. The *District Governance and Functions Handbook* describes the overall governance and decision-making structures for the colleges and the District (IV.A).

There are processes in place to allow and encourage innovation that leads to institutional excellence. Discussions for improvement take place at unit meetings and informally between colleagues, and these discussions and any results stemming from these discussions are well documented through the Program Review process. It is through this program review process that all ideas, including related resources and policy or significant institution-wide implications, are discussed and ranked. For example, the redesign of the shared governance structure in 2013 as well as the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook were vetted through all major campus committees for their input. In addition, all constituent groups were given the opportunity to participate with writing the Educational Strategic Master Planning and its supporting plans that include the Distance Education Plan, Human Resources Plan, Technology Resources Plan and Staff and Organizational Development Plan. (Standard IV.A.1).

The Integrated Planning & Governance Handbook clearly defines the role of each committee on campus as well as the College's policy regarding administrator, faculty, staff, and student participation in decision-making regarding institutional policies and procedures. In addition, the handbook defines the role of group in governance including planning and budget development and how recommendations for change are made. Each committee has an Operating Agreement, which establishes membership, and decision-making processes and these are posted on SharePoint. There are several documents that describe the official responsibilities and authority of each constituent group as it relates to curricular and other educational matters. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.3).

Faculty and administrators have ample opportunity for providing input on institutional policies, planning, and budget through participation on college-level governance committees, District wide executive administrative councils, and District-level governance committees. At all the colleges, administrators serve on governance committees based on their areas of expertise. The LACCD and AFT (American Federation of Teachers) Agreement 2014-2017 (Agreement) emphasizes the importance of faculty representation from the union and senate on participatory governance committees. The LACCD and AFT Agreement specifies which committees require faculty representation and those for which it is recommended. The Agreement requires faculty membership for both Budget and Strategic Planning Committees.

LACC administrators and faculty exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget as it relates to their areas of responsibility and expertise. The committee with primary oversight of institutional policies, planning, and budget is the College Council and has representation from all constituent groups. Other committees with administrator and faculty representation that work with institutional policies, planning, and budget are the Strategic Planning Committee, Budget Committee, and Educational Policies and Program Integrity. (Standard IV.A.3).

Faculty and administrators follow well-defined structures in making recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. All nine of the LACCD colleges

reference in their self evaluations the primacy of faculty in making recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. Administrative regulation E-65 lays out in great detail a step-by-step process for curriculum development and approval. This process recognizes the primacy of faculty members in making curriculum recommendations while also ensuring administrative input in the curriculum process.

At LACC, there is strong faculty involvement in and responsibility for curriculum and student learning programs and services. The Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook defines the role of governance committees that include curriculum and student learning programs and services. Curriculum needs are identified through the program review process and the Curriculum Handbook defines a formal process for approving new courses and programs. The Curriculum Committee operates under the auspices of the Academic Senate and has primary responsibility for making curriculum recommendations. There are various district-wide discipline committees to discuss and ensure faculty representation from each college in the district and make recommendations affecting the areas of curriculum to the District Curriculum Committee, which operates under the auspices of the District Academic Senate. In addition, LACC follows the District Administrative Regulation process for approving new courses and programs. (Standards IV.A.4, IV.A.5).

Student learning programs and services are assessed and improved through the program review process. This includes assessment of course student learning outcomes as well as program student learning outcomes. All distance education courses are required to go through the same processes as other courses. (Standard IV.A.4).

There are well-defined processes for communication before internal administrative and external Board decisions are made that impact faculty, staff, and students. Recommendations from governance and contractually mandated committees are solicited before decisions are made.

The roles of administrators and faculty in the development of District policy are delineated in Board Rule XVII, Article I-Academic Senate and Board of Trustees Shared Governance Policy and Article II-Students and Board of Trustees Shared Governance Policy and in Chancellor's Directive No. 70. LACCD does not have a classified senate. The AFT Staff Guild, Local 1521A, represents the full-time and part-time classified clerical/technical administrative staff. The Supervisory Employees' Union, S.E.I.U. Local 721, represents regular full-time and regular part-time classified employees of the District who are assigned to classifications in the Supervisory Unit.

"Role of the Unions," in the *District Governance and Functions Handbook*, describes District-level consultation between the administration and representatives of the six bargaining units. Consultation occurs through:

1. direct consultation during regular meetings between union representatives and the chancellor and/or the college presidents;
2. regular monthly grievance meetings between union representatives, the chancellor, the chancellor's designees and/or the college presidents;

3. participation in relevant District and college governance and decision-making committees, including the District Budget Committee, the Joint Labor/Management Benefits Committee, and the college governance councils; and
4. direct representation from the Resource Table during monthly Board meetings.

In some cases, it appears that classified staff do not have appropriate representation on District-level institutional governance committees regarding institutional planning, policies, and other key considerations. For example, the Student Success Initiative Committee (SSIC) states that the “overarching purpose of the Student Success Initiative is to create an effective District wide network of faculty, administrators and *staff* dedicated to improving student success.” However, the committee’s membership does not include representatives from the classified staff. Likewise, the committee membership of the District Planning Committee does not include representation from the classified staff.

At LACC, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives. The Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook includes a policy specifying the roles of each constituent group to ensure they work collaboratively and collegially in the participatory governance process. The Operating Agreement for each committee establishes the committee’s purpose, membership, and decision making processes. The structures and processes in place serve to facilitate timely action in College decision-making processes. (Standard IV.A.5).

The decision-making processes are outlined in the Integrated Planning and Governance Handbook and the Operating Agreement for each committee describes how the committee makes decisions and recommendations. Each committee at LACC has its own site on the College website where agendas, minutes, and documents are to be posted on a regular basis. The Committee Chair Handbook describes the process for posting all committee documents on the College website to be made accessible to the public. While many of the committees do have these documents posted online, many have not been updated in a timely manner and most are missing the annual assessment to be done by each committee. For example, the Curriculum Committee was five months behind in postings and the Facilities Planning Committee were behind almost two years. While many of these are being remedied, more needs to be done to ensure committee documents are posted in a timely manner. (Standard IV.A.6).

The College has clear ways of documenting decisions and disseminating them widely across the institution. The College Council and Academic Senate have a standing item on their agendas to share the status of previous recommendations. Committee chairs are given the Committee Chair Handbook, which outlines how to disseminate information to the College, but there is no formal training for the chairs. In addition, annual assessments are to be completed by each committee and the results shared with College Council or the Academic Senate as well as posted online. (Standards IV.A.6, IV.A.7).

The Self-Evaluation Report provides a list of improvements made because of a review of governance and decision-making policies, procedures and processes. These include creation of an online system for committees to track action plans and measures towards ESMP objectives, a revision to the budget development and resource allocation processes,

standardizing the template for committee annual assessments, approval of A New Model for Governance, which is to help ensure that faculty, staff, students, and administrators increase engagement and work cooperatively to make recommendations on policies and processes aimed at increasing student success. The College needs to reflect on and find ways of documenting two important matters: are sufficient numbers of employees across the College accessing and incorporating the information that is produced by all the outcomes of the participatory processes? Are the outcomes of the processes actually resulting in improvement to student success, maintaining or improving academic quality, and the general maintenance or improvement of the overall quality of the institution? It appears that the College recognizes this because it is stated that “starting in spring 2016, the College Council and Academic Senate will create an end of year document that describes all recommendations passed and how those recommendations resulted in improved College operations.” (Standard IV.A.7).

Conclusion

The College meets this Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

LACCD has clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of not only the colleges and the District, but also the Board members, the chancellor, and the college presidents. The District has completed and revised its governance structures and procedures which demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement. The District meets this standard.

Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 9 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District review the membership of institutional governance committees to ensure all employee groups, particularly classified staff, have formal input on institutional plans, policies, and other key considerations as appropriate. (Standard IV.A.5.).

Standard IV.B. – Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

LACC has a well-defined governance structure and the role of the President (Chief Executive Officer) is clearly outlined in each aspect of the governance structure. As a result, the CEO is able to provide effective leadership in leading and meeting all aspects of this standard. The CEO is responsible for overall institutional effectiveness and the integrated planning cycle.

The CEO participates in a variety of governance committees at the College and District level, including College Council, Bond Citizen Oversight Committee, District President's Council, District Budget Committee, and District Accreditation Planning meetings. The CEO periodically attends operational committee meetings, such as the Enrollment Management Committee, Department Chairs Council, and other campus committees as needed.

The CEO participates in community development by serving as an ex-officio member of the LACC Foundation Board, serving as the President of the LA Chamber of Commerce and the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.

Findings & Evidence

The CEO played an integral role in overseeing the development of the new Integrated Planning & Governance Handbook and provided final approval of the new handbook and process. (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.3).

Each unit within the organization, through its outlined assessment process, program review, and integrated planning process has the opportunity to submit resource requests for new positions as a part of the college's structure. In 2013, the CEO approved a realignment of its Academic Affairs IDWG areas, which resulted from an effort to provide an area (First Year Experience, student success, and Achieving the Dream) focus for each Dean. (Standard IV.B.2).

The self-evaluation states that, "The College agrees that the president provides effective leadership in selecting and developing personnel." In meeting with students, staff, faculty, and administrators, all referenced that they believe President Martinez to be accessible and that she provides support and leadership for the organization. (Standard IV.B.2).

The CEO has demonstrated communication within governance committees and the governance structure. The CEO provides regular reports to the College Council, publishes a regular newsletter, and meets regularly with a variety of community organizations providing information about the college. (Standard IV.B.6).

Prior to President Martinez' arrival at LACC, the College suspended its athletics program. The loss of the athletics program resulted in a decrease in FTES and a tangible sense of loss in community at LACC. Additionally, the previously approved new physical education building was removed from the capital projects program at LACC. The loss of this

previously funded and approved building has further impacted the Kinesiology Department and the prospect of re-establishing an athletics program, which was prematurely discontinued outside of established governance processes. Upon President Martinez' arrival to LACC, a viability study was conducted and a recommendation was made to President Martinez to re-establish an athletics program, which is supported by President Martinez. (Standard IV.B.3).

The LACC CEO has designated the ALO position to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The CEO encourages all employees to participate in the accreditation process. A fairly small representation of employees (20) has completed the accreditation training offered online by the ACCJC (ST4B-6). The CEO has served on two external accreditation site visit teams (2014, Lassen Community College & 2015, Berkeley City College) and has encouraged other LACC administrators to participate on external teams. (Standard IV.B.4).

The LACC CEO is active on the District's governance committees, such as the Board of Trustees, Whistleblower Committee, Executive Budget Committee, and Accreditation Planning Committee. Through her participation in committees, President Martinez is able to ensure that all statutes, regulations, board policies, and LACC practices are aligned with planning and budget priorities. (Standard IV.B.5).

The CEO has demonstrated communication with governance committees. The CEO provides regular reports to the College Council, publishes a regular newsletter, and meets regularly with a variety of college and community organizations providing information about the college. The self-evaluation cites evidence and indicates that, "Employees agree that the President effectively communicates the College's values, goals, priorities, and commitment to student learning and District issues with the campus community." All three questions in this particular piece of evidence show a decline in positive response from 2014-2015, with one of the responses #19c falling below 50%. However, in our discussions with faculty and staff in a variety of areas, including an open forum held with the college community during the site visit, we found evidence of climate survey participation and awareness of survey results. In our meetings with student leaders, however, we found that students were lacking awareness of student climate survey results. (Standard IV.B.6).

Conclusion

The College meets this Standard.

Standard IV.C. - Governing Board

General Observations

The Board of Trustees (Board) of the Los Angeles Community College District provides effective leadership for its complex system. The seven-member Board of Trustees has worked with the chancellor to develop clear lines of authority at the college and District levels.

Findings and Evidence

The roles and responsibilities of the Board and LACCD administrative leadership are codified in the Board Rules. The District administration implements those rules through creation of Chancellor's Directives and Administrative Regulations. In addition, the Board has four standing committees: Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success; Budget and Finance; Legislative and Public Affairs; and Facilities Master Planning and Oversight. Membership is limited to Board members only, has a specific charge, and is designed to ensure the Board exercises authority and responsibility to assure the colleges and District run effectively. Chaired by the vice president of the Board and made up of all Board members, the Committee of the Whole reviews District wide standards and performance for efficiency and quality. The governing authority rests with the entire Board, not with individual members. (Standards IV.C.1-2).

The Board Rule (BR) found in Chapter X: Human Resources, Article III, Selection Policies #10308 clearly delineates the process for the hiring of the college CEOs; no such Board Rule exists for the hiring of the chancellor. However, the Board used a clearly defined process in the hiring of the most recent chancellor which has yet to be codified. HR E-210: Performance Evaluation, College President/Senior Academic Executive clearly delineates the process for the evaluation of college presidents. Chancellor's Directive (CD) 122 provides for an evaluation process for the chancellor and the college presidents and is outlined in the executive contracts. The process provided for in CD 122, however, is not evidence of a Board policy. (Standard IV.C.3).

The Board holds regularly scheduled meetings that allow for public comment on general and specific agenda items. The Board holds meetings at the colleges as well as at the Education Service Center (ESC), where the chancellor and District's administrative offices are housed. At the Board meetings, there are opportunities for public comment in general or on specific agenda items. The Board uses the Legislative and Public Affairs Committee to engage discussion about issues related to the public interest. (Standard IV.C.4).

Board policies are codified in Board Rules and are available on the District website. The Board Rules establish the Board's role in establishing policy with the acknowledgement that it has the ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Board also has standing committees designed to ensure they are abreast of matters pertaining to its responsibility for financial integrity and stewardship of the District. (Standards IV.C.5).

The Board consists of seven members elected at-large for terms of four years. Elections are held every two years, alternating with three members being chosen in one election and four members at the other. The president and vice president of the Board of Trustees are elected by the Board for a one-year term at the annual organizational and regular meeting in July, and a nonvoting student trustee is elected annually by students for a one-year term beginning June 1. The student trustee has an advisory vote on actions other than personnel-related and collective bargaining items. (Standard IV.C.6).

Board Rule 2301 gives the Board general authority to establish rules and regulations that are consistent with law. This Board Rule also authorizes the Board to delegate rulemaking authority to LACCD officers (such as the chancellor), employees, or committees. Under Board Rule 2902, the Board expressly authorizes the chancellor to adopt and implement Administrative Regulations. BR 2418.12, adopted by the Board in February 2007, directs the chancellor to perform periodic reviews of the Board Rules, Administrative Regulations, and procedural guides. Administrative Regulation C-12, also adopted in February 2007, establishes that reviews and revisions will be conducted by staff on a triennial basis and the process to be used. While there was evidence that revisions to Board Rules were forwarded to the Board for approval, there was no evidence that the triennial reviews were communicated to the Board when no revisions were made. No evidence was found that there is any assessment or review by the Board of the policies for their effectiveness in fulfilling the District mission. (Standard IV.C.7).

As evidenced in its Board Rules, Chapter I, Article II, entitled the "Mission of the Los Angeles Community College District," the Board exercises oversight of the District's educational programs and has established an Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee to monitor the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. Through the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS), the Board of Trustees is kept regularly informed on key indicators of student learning and achievement. Additionally, Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review of the colleges' academic quality and institutional plans. Cyclic approval of Educational and Strategic Master Plans; review of District wide completion data covering a six-year period with a focus on improving student success data and academic quality; and an annual review and analysis of the state's Student Success Scorecard, which reports major indicators of student achievement, is documented. (Standard IV.C.8).

Board Rule 2105 requires a formal orientation for new trustees. The last orientation occurred in June 2015 and included an overview of the functions and responsibilities of District Office divisions, conflict of interest policy, and the Brown Act. (Standard IV.C.9)

The annual process for regular self evaluations of the Board is delineated in BR 2301.10. The Board of Trustees has conducted its annual self evaluation during a public session in which they reviewed data results from the preceding year and established new annual goals. (Standard IV.C.10).

The Board is in compliance with establishing a policy on Board member code of ethics and conflict of interest with Board Rule 14000, Chapter XIV, and the implementation of these standards is captured in the 2013 Actionable Improvement Plan (March 19, 2013). This plan outlines specific actions that Board members should take to reinforce these standards and to demonstrate its support as a collective entity by adoption of its Code of Ethical Conduct. (Standard IV.C.11).

The Board sets policy with the delegation of responsibility to the chancellor and presidents for the execution of policies and procedures as well as day-to-day operational control of the District. Additionally, Board policy outlines the role of a trustee and identifies that “Authority is given to the Chancellor as the Trustees’ sole employee” with a pledge to “work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record.” The chancellor’s job description as well as BR 2902 authorizes the chancellor to adopt and implement administrative regulations and delegation of authority to the chancellor and presidents to administer the institutions. The functional map outlines the lines of authority and responsibilities. (Standard IV.C.12).

The Board is extremely knowledgeable and fully engaged in all aspects of accreditation. The Board has been deliberate in its acquisition and application of knowledge on accreditation. Board members are aware of the importance of their role in the accreditation process. All Board members participate in ACCJC’s online training program on the topic. Meeting minutes document the formation of a Board ad hoc committee on accreditation in 2013 with the stated purpose of supporting all colleges participating in any aspect of the accreditation process. The Board has dedicated funds to support efforts and review any reports prior to submission to the Commission by any of the nine colleges. (Standard IV.C.13).

Conclusions

The College does not meet the Standard due to compliance matters related to Standards IV.C.3 and IV.C.7, as described below.

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 10 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board adopt policies that clearly define the process for the selection and evaluation of the chancellor. (Standard IV.C.3).

District Recommendation 11 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board establish a formal process for approving the review of policies in which no revisions are made and to regularly assess the effectiveness of all policies in fulfilling the District mission. (Standard IV.C.7).

Standard IV.D. - Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) is a complex, multi-college system comprised of a District Office, which houses the chancellor, senior administrators and District classified professional staff, as well as nine comprehensive community colleges that provide services in 40 cities and communities and cover an area of more than 882 square miles in the greater Los Angeles basin.

In total, the District has 46 District wide councils, committees, and consultative bodies in which District and college administrative staff, faculty, classified staff, and students regularly participate. All governance councils and committees maintain agendas and meeting summaries/minutes on the District website.

In previous years, operations of the District Office, now referred to as the Educational Services Center (ESC), were highly centralized, and many college decisions related to finance and budget, capital projects, hiring, payroll and contracts were made by District personnel. Operations subsequently have been increasingly decentralized. Colleges have been given considerable 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. Diligent work by the institution has clarified functions and delineated areas of responsibilities between colleges and the ESC. Original recommendations regarding role delineation and decision-making processes in 2009 were resolved, and, by 2012, the District was commended for its work in this area. The ESC continues to evaluate these delineations on an ongoing basis.

In 2011, the District began a review of the budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayments. In 2012, the District developed and approved a new, well-defined allocation model that appears to be understood widely across the institution.

In the 2012 accreditation visit to the colleges, the District received a recommendation to adopt and fully implement an allocation model for its constituent colleges that addresses the size, economies of scale, and the stated mission of the individual colleges. By 2013, the recommendation was resolved, and the District received a commendation for its effort as well as for its transparent and collaborative process.

Findings and Evidence

The chancellor demonstrates his leadership and communication by various means. Evidence has shown that the chancellor communicates with all employees of the District about educational excellence and integrity through two publications posted on the District website: *Synergy* and *Accreditation 2016*. He leads a variety of meetings in which he communicates his expectations for excellence as well as reviews and discusses roles, authority and responsibility between colleges. These meetings include Chancellor's Cabinet, Presidents'

Council, and meetings with faculty and classified leadership. In addition, he leads and meets with a variety of District committees in which he articulates and provides leadership for the effective operation of the District as a whole and individual colleges. The Board of Trustees has approved a District/college functional area map, developed in consultation with all major stakeholders across the District. The functional map clarifies the structure of District administrative offices and their relationship to the colleges, aligns District administrative functions with Accreditation Standards, and specifies outcome measures appropriate to each function identified. (Standard IV.D.1).

The chancellor directs the ESC staff to ensure the delivery of effective and adequate District services to support the mission of each college. In addition to outlining the operational responsibilities and functions of the District Office, the 2013 *District Governance and Functions Handbook* details the District wide governance processes. The chancellor ensures effective and adequate District services in support of the colleges by requiring the ESC divisions to conduct an annual program review. As documented in the ESC Unit Program Review Guide, the ESC divisions monitor Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) with clear links to District-level goals and consider their main contributions to the mission of the colleges, goals, effectiveness, and/or student achievement or learning. In addition, 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 District managers, deans, directors, vice presidents, and presidents participate in the survey. A review of the ESC program reviews reveal that all ESC divisions have completed at least one cycle of program review. Data from the ESC User Survey was disaggregated and used to identify strengths and weaknesses, receive feedback on the effectiveness of their services, and gather suggestions for improvement. Divisions with identified areas for improvement create plans to improve their services and strengthen their support of the colleges in achieving their missions. The Board received a presentation on the status of the ESC Program Review process in spring 2015. As documented by the *District Governance and Functions Handbook*, the District Budget Committee (DBC) provides leadership on District-level budget policies. Membership includes all nine college presidents, District Academic Senate (DAS) representatives, 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. (Standard IV.D.2).

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. DBC Minutes show that a review of other multi-college District budget models and policies was also conducted. This review led the District to adopt a model that established minimum-based funding. The Board of Trustees approved Phase I of the new allocation model in June 2012. This phase focused on the annual allocation of resources. During spring 2013, the District worked on Phase II, which covered the review of college carryover funds, reserve balances, college growth formula and college debts, and operating deficits. DBC minutes from September 18, 2013, show that these

changes were all reviewed and discussed at the DBC and approved by the Board of Trustees at their October 9, 2013.

The allocation model begins with an annual base allocation to fully fund minimum administrative staffing for each college. In particular, the base allocation includes funding for the following positions: the president, vice presidents, an institutional research dean, a facilities manager, and a number of deans (based on size of the college). In addition, the base allocation includes Maintenance and Operations costs based on an average cost per-gross-square-footage (currently \$8.49/square foot). After allocating the minimum base allocation, all remaining revenue (with a few exceptions, such as international student revenues) is distributed based on the each college's proportion of the funded FTES for the District. In the event that a college suffered a reduction in funding due to the new model, provisions for transition funding are included in the model. The model also provides charges for Central Accounts, Educational Services Center functions, and appropriate reserve levels at both the District and the colleges. The colleges can retain up to five percent of their year-end balances of the prior year Unrestricted General Fund budget, excluding the prior years' carryover funds. The model also includes provisions regarding how colleges with prior-year over-expenditures can pay off the debt. The model was included in the 2014-15 Final Budget of the District as Appendix F, and implementation of the model can be tracked in the 2015-16 Final Budget. As of the end of the 2014-15 year, there were five colleges with a total debt of \$19.2 million owed back to the District for prior-year over-expenditures. The colleges continue to express concerns regarding the handling of outstanding debt. (Standards IV.D.2-3).

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. The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditures. The District website has detailed monthly expenditure reports for the District and the colleges to assist with tracking, monitoring, and maintaining budgets, financial commitments, and expenditures. The colleges and District financial reports are reviewed by staff and are submitted to the Board of Trustees. Evidence in the self evaluation illustrates that college presidents have full responsibility and authority to conduct their work without interference from the chancellor. College presidents have full authority in the selection and evaluation of their staff and management team. (Standard IV.D.3).

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 necessary, reassignment or dismissal. Evaluations are reviewed with the Board of Trustees in closed session. College presidents are also given full authority over their budgets and in allocating resources at their campuses. 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.” (Standard IV.D.4).

The LACCD Strategic Plan Vision 2017 (DSP) was created collaboratively among key constituent groups, with interviews confirming that faculty members, classified staff members, and administrators had ample opportunity for input. While written after the college strategic plans, the DSP generally integrates all of the college strategic plans by establishing a common framework through four overarching goals. The most consistent alignment, however, occurs through the annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports that are reported to the Board of Trustees. Using a standard report template and common metrics and data sources developed collegially by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), the colleges map college goals to the District goals, compare their progress against the District as a whole in their reviews, and provide an analysis of strengths and weaknesses in accomplishing planned objectives. These assessments, in turn, inform the Board of Trustees’ annual goals as well as future college and District planning priorities. Interviews and a review of District Budget Committee (DBC) minutes show the existence of integrated financial planning within the District. Incorporating college and District-level enrollment projections, the colleges and District jointly establish District wide FTES targets for the upcoming academic year in the spring semester. These targets are reviewed by the chancellor, the District Budget Committee, and the Board Budget and Finance Committee prior to final adoption of the budget in August of each year. (Standard IV.D.5).

The District Budget Allocation Model utilizes these FTES projections and additional revenue streams to allocate funds to the colleges as well as to the Educational Services Center (ESC). In March, the colleges and the ESC develop budgets that reflect their planning and institutional priorities. Prior to adoption, college and ESC budgets are reviewed by the Board Budget and Finance Committee to ensure that priorities align with the DSP, Board goals, and the chancellor’s recommendations. The colleges and the District monitor revenue and expenditure projections throughout the year and have the ability to update financial plans and FTES growth targets. The District chief financial officer, college representatives, and ESC staff members meet on a quarterly basis to review revenue and cost projections and discuss adjustments or actions needed to maintain their alignment. (Standard IV.D.5).

The Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC) coordinates the activities of several District-level, technology-related advisory groups and provides a forum for consultation on all technology-related issues. The TPPC developed the District Technology Plan, which created a framework of goals and a set of actions to guide District wide as well as technology planning. The District Technology Implementation Plan established measures and prioritized deployment of technology solutions in consideration of available resources. In addition, the TPPC serves as a clearinghouse for all policy issues related to District wide technology systems (e.g., updates on the SIS development). (Standard IV.D.5).

District/college integrated planning also occurs during operational planning for District wide 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 District/college collaboration,

coordination with centralized District service units, and interaction with various District-level committees. Interviews during the visit confirmed intra-District discussions that impacted integrated planning had occurred during the Council of Academic Affairs, Council of Student Services, the District Academic Senate, Student Information System Development Team, and the District Research Committee. (Standard IV.D.5).

Various mechanisms are used to evaluate the effectiveness of District/college integrated planning. The Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey is used to assess budget development and resource allocation, enrollment management, FTES, and facilities planning as well as the governance process as a whole. With the assistance of the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division, DPAC has analyzed three years of the survey (2010, 2012, and 2014) to look at trends and develop improvement plans based on the data. District-level planning and policy committees assess their effectiveness through annual committee self evaluation reviews. In its 2015-16 work plan, DPAC is charged with systematically reviewing these self evaluations and the Council will be making recommendations for improvement to the committees. Lastly, the ESC Program Review process assesses performance and outcomes through an annual User Survey and information specific to each service unit. A review of DPAC minutes as well as interviews with DPAC co-chairs and the vice chancellor of educational programs and institutional effectiveness provide evidence that the District regularly reviews its processes and provides opportunities for dialogue among key stakeholders. (Standards IV.D.2, IV.D.5, IV.D.7).

A considerable amount of communication occurs between the nine colleges and the District. In total, the District has 46 District wide 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. Seven District wide 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. (Standard IV.D.6).

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. 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 the District and colleges. (Standard IV.D.6).

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. The District planned to implement a new intranet site in

December 2015 to improve employee access to Educational Services Center divisions, units, and services; however, as of the evaluation visit, the intranet was still in the latter stages of implementation. Information Technology maintains 78 active listservs. These listservs include the District wide consultative bodies, administrative councils, and operational committees as well as subject-specific groups such as articulation officers, curriculum chairs, counselors, and IT managers. Each listserv has a coordinator/owner charged with maintaining an accurate list of members. Interviews during the visit revealed that while subscriptions to the listservs are typically comprised of members to the committees and councils, the subscriptions are open to any interested employee of the District. (Standard IV.D.6).

Results from the Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey and discussions with representatives from key stakeholder groups, however, indicate concerns over effective communication about District decision-making bodies. In all three years of the survey, over half of respondents (58 percent in the most recent survey) said decisions made through participatory governance at the District level are not communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders. Moreover, among the most frequently mentioned concerns about District participatory governance across the three survey administrations has been a “lack of communication or transparency” and “insufficient representation or unbalanced participation from stakeholders.” Responding to the results in the survey, the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division and DPAC members co-presented a workshop at the annual DAS Summit in September 2015. The workshop addressed District wide 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. On the other hand, there was no evidence of workshops with members of the classified staff or other stakeholder groups. (Standard IV.D.6).

In 2009, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC-formerly called the District Planning Committee or DPC) developed a District Governance and Decision-Making Survey and administered it in 2010. The DPAC implemented a cyclical process for system-level evaluation and improvement. The evaluation cycle has been institutionalized and District processes have been revised in support of institutional effectiveness as indicated in the development of new intranet sites for committee communication. (Standard IV.D.7).

With assistance from the EPIE division, DPAC established an annual self evaluation process for all District governance committees. These common self-assessments document the accomplishments, challenges, and areas for improvement for the committees during the prior year. Results of the assessment are reviewed by each respective committee and serve as the basis for changes and improvements to committee function. Minutes confirm that DPAC reaffirmed their responsibility to ensure self evaluations are conducted by District governance committees, results are posted online, and that they are used to improve committee effectiveness. (Standard IV.D.7).

Role delineations are evaluated during the regular review of functional area maps. 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. (Standard IV.D.1, IV.D.2, IV.D.7).

The *District Governance and Functions Handbook* is regularly reviewed and updated by District stakeholders under the coordination of the DPAC. A section of the handbook describes all District wide councils, committees, and consultative bodies. These entities were first formalized in 1994 by Chancellor's Directive (CD) 70: District wide 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 currently in process as shown in DPAC minutes of November 20, 2015. (Standard IV.D.7).

Conclusions

The College meets the Standards for multi-college districts.

The chancellor clearly and appropriately delegates authority and responsibility to the college presidents and communicates expectations for educational excellence and integrity to the District community. The District has made consistent progress in detailing areas of responsibilities, creating administrative and governance decision-making processes, and evaluating these functions and processes regularly for continuous quality improvement. Clear evaluation processes for the services provided by the ESC have been established and institutionalized. In recent years, the District, in collaboration with the colleges, has created a completely new resource allocation model in order to adjust the differential impact of fixed operating costs on the colleges based on size. In addition to the Budget Allocation policy, the District also adopted new District financial accountability policies to help control expenditures and maintain fiscal stability. Both policies include provisions that identify processes for regularly evaluating the budget allocation model.

While college planning drives the overall planning in the District in a decentralized model, the District has provided frameworks and decision-making processes that maintain alignment across the District. In particular, the annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports given to the Board of Trustees' Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee provide excellent examples of integrated planning in the District. The District has been especially diligent in providing formalized mechanisms for evaluating its decision-making processes and services using data and collegial feedback for continuous quality improvement. In the future, evaluations of the decision-making process should include analyses on the effects of decentralization on institutional excellence.

Given the complexity and size of the institution, as well as the decentralized nature of the decision-making process, the efforts of the District and colleges to collaborate and work collegially to support student learning and achievement are noticeable and commendable; however, unique challenges for effective and widespread communication about District wide decisions remain. The District should continue to address these communication gaps, particularly among classified professionals.

The team commends the District for its commitment to continuous quality improvement by building evaluation loops for all its services, decision-making processes, and institutional performance.

District Recommendations for Improvement

District Recommendation 12 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District expand efforts to communicate decisions made in the institutional governance process to all stakeholders. (Standard IV.D.6.).

Quality Focus Essay Team Feedback

The Los Angeles City College (QFE) is developed based on Self Evaluation process. Through the QFE, the college establishes a framework for identifying areas of improvement and identifies strategies to improve institutional practices based on action plans. The College identified short-term and long-term action plans. The short-term action plans are expected to be completed based on existing processes and procedures. The long term identified as two-year action projects that require expansion of existing processes and procedures. This is of critical importance to meet the College mission and to meet institution-set standards and targets.

The College selection of Access and Success to improve student enrollment and develop learner-centered pathways will help facilitate meeting its targets and help student achieve the educational goals in completing programs in a shorter span of time. This will be achieved using the established integrated planning process. The action plans will help the College meet its enrollment targets and facilitate communication and collaboration between various service areas including student services, facilities, Institutional Effectiveness, and various committees and decision making entities as identified in the self-evaluation process. The action plans related to the accreditation standards and have emerged based on College's evaluation of its own effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of institution-set standards. The findings and general issues from the self-evaluation are identified throughout the standards.

Enrollment management is of critical importance to the long-term financial health of the College, as revenue is tied to enrollments and college is not able to meet its current targets. The College has developed processes and procedure to collect and analyze operational data to facilitate discussion with the constituents on a regular basis to facilitate rational decisions. The college objective of improving efficiency by monitoring enrollments and budgets may increase discretionary funds and improve financial stability to support and sustain student learning outcomes and services. The College has established timeline from spring 2016-2019 to create an Enrollment Management task force to effectively:

- Manage room utilization/scheduling of course offerings through automated software,
- Increase Average Fill Rate and Efficiency,
- Increase Communication across the college constituents including students and staff,
- Collaborate with various Departments to develop Marketing, Recruitment and Success/Retention plan,
- Co-ordinate with Distance Education Committee to optimize course offerings based on student demand and needs,
- Elimination of non-viable programs,
- Increased enrollments from feeder high schools,
- Increase capacity of high demand programs,
- Provide student services to online students as offered to traditional students, and
- Increase student satisfaction with College Support Services.

To achieve the outcomes desired in a shorter span of time in terms of completion and achievement, the college intends to improve learner-centered pathways. The College has developed timeline and identified responsible committee and resources to meet this Goal. The Student Success Initiative provides the platform to ensure orientation, assessment, placement, and development of Student Education plans. The College is planning to expand the first year experience of full time students and increase participation from feeder high schools.

The development of City pathways and Basic skills pathways along with development of curriculum with an attempt to accelerate student completion and achievement. In addition to hiring additional staff, training is planned for online faculty to familiarize and participate in the first-year student programs.

The College based on the self-evaluation process appears to take initiative in Student services and has plans for a comprehensive Enrollment Management to improve communication and Collaboration to address the shortfall in targets and have a learner centered approach.

The Quality Focus Essay (QFE) includes “expected outcomes” for each phase of the APs that describe the expected results of the practices. In particular, continuous assessment and evaluation could provide information about how successfully each phase has been achieved (this could be especially helpful given the long-range nature of the action plans). The QFE establishes a high-level view for continuous quality improvement for the college. At this current stage of the QFE model, any recommendations provided by the visiting team should be considered as correlating information that can align with and/or provide support for the Action Projects.