This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited Los Angeles Harbor College on March 6 – March 10, 2016.
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Summary of the External Evaluation Report

Institution: Los Angeles Harbor College
Dates of Visit: March 7-10, 2016
Team Chair: Henry Yong

A twelve member accreditation team visited Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) March 7-10, 2016 for the purposes of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and United States Department of Education regulations. The team evaluated the adherence of the College to requirements and regulations, institutional effectiveness as it relates to the mission statement, the use of data for continuous improvement, and the infrastructure needed to support the functions of the College.

In advance of the visit, the Team Chair and his assistant made a pre-visit to the College to discuss the context of the visit with President Lee and his staff on January 13, 2016 and the team met for a team training on January 26, 2016.

The evaluation team received the College’s self evaluation document in digital format several weeks prior to the visit and those who requested it received a hard copy as well. The team found the report to be generally comprehensive and accurate document, addressing regulations, requirements and the ACCJC Standards. The team found, both in the document and in face-to-face interaction that the document and planning for the visit involved campus-wide discussion and interaction.

On Sunday, March 6, 2016, a portion of the team, including those dedicated to Standard III, arrived in Los Angeles to meet with the District Team. They met on the afternoon of the 6th and then joined the larger team in San Pedro, CA, near the college, for a debrief and first team meeting. The smaller team returned to Los Angeles that evening in order to attend a second meeting with the District Team and to meet with officials from LACCD. The remainder of the team met to write and discuss the document. The visit to the campus began in the afternoon of March 7th with a Welcome Reception and an opportunity to meet administrators, faculty, staff and students.

The team began interviews and meetings with key staff and examination of documents on campus on Tuesday, March 8, 2016 and continued this process through the morning of Thursday, March 10, 2016. The team had the opportunity to interact with a large number of staff and students in a variety of settings including formal interviews, hallway chats, and open forums. Each evening, the team met to share and discuss documentation and discuss findings.

Evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, documents such as institutional reports, program review, student learning outcomes data and evidence of using those data for improvement, committee minutes and agendas, and the College governance structure. These documents were viewed both in hard copy format and online.

The team appreciated the enthusiasm found on campus, the willingness of the administration to provide a wide array of documents, and the availability of all involved for interviews. The team found the College staff to be forthcoming both in providing documentation and in meeting with the team.
Introduction

Los Angeles Harbor College is one of nine Colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District, the largest district in the state. The College is located approximately 20 miles south of downtown Los Angeles.

The College, established in 1949, was first known as “Harbor Tech” and then “Harbor Junior College” before adopting its present name in 1965. The initial enrollment of the College was 650 students. Today, Harbor College enrolls approximately 11,000 students at a single campus location.

Harbor College serves a diverse community and that is reflected in the student population. In fall 2014, the student population was primarily Hispanic (54%), followed by White (14%), African American (14%), Asian/Pacific Islander (17%), and American Indian/Multi-Ethnic/Other (1%). These percentages remained stable from fall 2012 to fall 2014.

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

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

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

Commendations

Harbor College considers itself to be “Happy Harbor” and a positive climate was certainly evident during the visit. On the whole, the administration, faculty, staff and students were pleasant and
forthcoming. Many outstanding areas were noted and the following were identified for commendation.

The team:

1. commends the Culturally Responsive Training (CRT) initiative for increasing cultural sensitivity, promoting inclusion, tolerance, and acceptance. (III.A.12, III.A.14)
2. commends the LA Harbor College Initiative on API Student Data Disaggregation, for identifying specific groups of under-performing and under-served students, and the use of data-driven decisions to intervene with appropriate supportive services to strengthen student success and student equity. (I.B.4)
3. commends the thoughtful design, and functional space utilization of recently constructed buildings, such as the Library Learning Resource Center, Science Complex, and the Technology Building. (III.B.2)
4. commends the proactive facilities management, emergency preparedness and attention to campus security. (III.B.3)
5. commends the Child Development Center to serving the college multi-generational community, and the community-at-large. (III.A.12, IIC.1.)
6. commends the exemplary programs that serve student success and student equity, such as Culinary Arts, Umoja, Puente, Middle College, CHAMPS, and others, for service to the campus community, and the community-at-large. (II.C.2)
7. commends the students for being very engaged in college activities, processes, college life, and the governance of the College. (II.C.3)
8. commends the positive campus climate, cohesion, collegiality of the campus, and the commitment to serving the community; which foster innovations in programs and services to serve student success and student equity. (IV.A.1)

**Recommendations**

1. In order to increase institutional effectiveness and address existing equity gaps, the team recommends that learning outcomes be disaggregated at the program (PLO) and institutional (ISLO) levels, and that these data be used for continuous quality improvement. This can be facilitated through the use of the HAPS system. (I.B.2, I.B.6)
2. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college revisit the tools and processes it uses for program review and ensure that comprehensive program reviews are conducted on schedule and be integrated into planning and decision-making processes. These reviews should be implemented consistently with resources committed to support their implementation. (I.B.9, II.A.3)
3. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the assessment of outcomes should be increasingly used in planning for improvement regarding student success, strategic planning, and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.9, II.A.16, II.B.3, II.C.1, II.C.2, II.C.3)

4. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the college should develop a comprehensive, integrated professional development plan that maximizes resources, coordinates efforts, and establishes a method by which the activities as well as the planning processes can be assessed to promote continuous improvement. (III.A.14, III.C.4)

5. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, Distance Education should provide training for faculty, develop standards for effective contact, inventory the General Education mode of delivery, and determine the necessity for Substantive Change. The College may also wish to include additional web-based information for student support, especially with regard to online classes. (III.A.14, III.C.3, III.C.4)

6. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, Tech support services should be coordinated and strengthened to support instructional and campus support services. (III.C.3)

7. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, it is recommended that the College seek redress within the guidelines of the LACCD Resource Allocation Model, to resolve the debt to the district that the College has accumulated utilizing the internal process with the District Budget Committee, and through the internal district governance process (III.D.1).
ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team affirms that Los Angeles Harbor College, a recognized College of the Los Angeles Community College District, is authorized to operate as a post-secondary educational institution and is approved to offer undergraduate education in preparation for transfer to a four-year institution. The team verified that Los Angeles Harbor College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. Operational Status

The team affirms that the College is operational, with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

3. Degrees

Through College’s self study report, website, catalog and other publications throughout the college, it appears that a substantial portion of the Los Angeles Harbor college educational offerings are programs that lead to associate degrees. A significant proportion of its students are enrolled in them. Furthermore, there are multiple two year programs. The College offers 43 degrees in associate of arts, associate of science, and associate degrees for transfer; and 26 certificates of achievement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The team affirms that Los Angeles Harbor College has a full-time College President appointed by the Los Angeles Community College District governing board. The College President is responsible for administering the policies adopted by the governing board and executes all its decisions within the institution. President Lee possesses the requisite authority to administer Board policies and does not serve as the chair of the governing board.

5. Financial Accountability
The team affirms that the District annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant. Evidence shows that the audits were completed and are available to review on the District’s Website. Reports available were for the years ending June 30, 2001 to 2015.

The team affirms that the college is in compliance with Title IV funding regulations. While the Perkin’s default rate has exceeded the 30% rate for the last three years, the college has submitted a corrections plan which was submitted and approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The college is ending the program to avoid the continuance of the default rate.

From the District Team

ER 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 Loans default rates. The District has Perkins Loans outstanding (over 240 days in default) totaling $1.8 million, but when compared to total loans outstanding for the District of $270 million, the default rate is only 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 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 District meets the Eligibility Requirement.
Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality, and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

Standard IA: Mission

General Observations

The Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) Mission statement, as found in the self study report and on the college website an appropriate and sufficiently detailed mission statement for the area it serves. The 2016 Mission statement in the self study evaluation report and the college website, however, differs from the one in the 2014-16 college catalog furnished to the evaluating team during team visit. The mission clearly defines the college’s educational purposes as well as its intended population, degrees and certificates it offers. It is stated that the college mission is included on committee agenda and committee meetings, professional and staff development activities. This is the case with the agendas viewed by the team.

Findings and Evidence

Los Angeles Harbor College’s comprehensive mission statement is reflective of the curriculum and services it provides to its diverse urban/suburban service population. The mission statement is published widely, including in consultative meeting agendas and is understood by a large percentage of the college workforce, as assessed on the Campus Climate Survey. The mission was reviewed and revised in summer 2015 through a collegial consultation process involving the College Planning Council. The process and frequency for mission review and revision both previous to this and going forward was unclear. The college should develop a timeline to regularly review the mission for currency. (I.A. 1, I.A.3, I.A.4)

The college recently reviewed its mission statement, embedding its assessment within the statement by linking mission achievement to performance on institutional learning outcomes. Additionally, progress on goals of the college’s Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) also measure mission achievement by publishing student performance measures for each goal. In the Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS), annual Unit Plans are required to link to Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, where appropriate, and/or SEMP goals and measures. Some of these measures have an established institutional standard. (I.A.3)

Units whose performance do not meet the minimum institutional standard are required to develop at least one Improvement Plan to remedy the deficiency. An Improvement Plan is required before resource allocation requests may proceed. The Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC) Request for Position Form promotes the use of data, program review, and college goals to justify faculty positions for consideration. (I.A.2, I.A.3)

Conclusions: The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations for Compliance: None

Recommendation for Improvement: None
Standard IB: Assuring Academic Quality & Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College has policies and procedures, governed by the Curriculum Committee, with regard to the definition and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). There is clear and broad faculty representation on this committee. While some disaggregation of data exists, it is primarily at the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) level.

Findings and Evidence

The college publishes and updates a number of manuals to support processes of student outcomes assessment, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness. The team documented manuals to support program review, planning, and outcomes assessment, along with visual models of these processes, where applicable. In addition, the college recently published a compendium of longitudinal trend data in its SEMP factbook. Dialog was documented consistently in a few areas (SSSP/Equity, College Planning Council). In observing a class, for example, it does appear that, through a new program, The Cultural Responsive Training, founded out of the Equity Initiative, dialog and practice are in midst of change. Classroom observation demonstrated clear training outcomes being embedded into the instructional quality and engagement of the students for stronger student learning outcomes. Yet, these outcomes still need data analysis once the annual cycle is completed. With the introduction of HAPS, it will be important for the College to better integrate comprehensive program review into annual planning processes. (I.B.1)

The college developed a set of policies and procedures governing learning outcomes and assessment processes through its Curriculum Committee, which contains broad faculty representation. The status of SLO assessments and use of results for improvement are documented in the SEMP Factbook and on the HAPS webpage. Although the college is in its third cycle of assessment, many courses still lack at least one assessment; however, this could be due to lagging data entry from the previous paper-based process. College constituents use the HAPS system to record SLO assessments following the Nichols’ 5-column model that requires an improvement plan to be developed and implemented when targets are not met. Requests for resource allocation require an improvement plan to be in place. The HAPS replaces a paper-based record-keeping system for SLOs; data entry of previously completed assessments is ongoing. (I.B.2)

Each course SLO is mapped to PLOs, and ultimately, ISLOs/GELOs. PLOs and ISLOs are assessed by counting the number of mapped course SLOs that met their benchmark. While mapping, versus direct assessment, is a path chosen by many colleges, it impedes the potential to disaggregate by demographic groups and other targets. Currently, all levels of assessments are disaggregated only by course-level characteristics such as instructional method (DE vs. non-DE). (I.B.2)

The college established institutional standards in 2015 for course completion; college persistence; degrees, certificates and transfers (counts); licensure pass rates; and job placement rates. Standards were set based on a 3-year average and reviewed and approved by the College Planning Council. Performance on these metrics are intended to be reviewed by the Student Success Coordinating
Committee and College Planning Council. However, there are no concrete plans to strategize solutions when standards are not met. In the most recent publication (SEMP Factbook), all standards were exceeded. The college will need to develop an intentional process to review and remedy performance below institution-set standards. (I.B.3)

Data for institutional standards are disaggregated by demographic groups on student achievement measures.

The college would benefit from setting aspirational goals and prominently link them to all student achievement metrics that have institutional standards. Institutional standards serve only as a performance “floor.” Therefore, the college should ensure that college planning processes focus on targets as well as minimum standards. In addition, the college should establish specific 3-year targets for all relevant measures in the LAHC Strategic Educational Master Plan 2014-17. While SEMP Objectives and Measures are “measurable,” no specific numeric targets are indicated, making it difficult to judge significant improvements over time. (I.B.3)

The new HAPS system facilitates the integration of assessment and achievement data in the planning process. (See I.B.2. above) (I.B.3)

However, while lower performing Units are required to create improvement plans to try to mitigate shortfalls, other units with average results are not equally compelled to self-reflect and develop improvement plans (unless additional financial resources are sought). This is a potential weakness in the system. The college should consider setting aspirational targets with plans created to support unit improvement or narrow equity gaps. (I.B.4)

A program review process appears to have been in place for some time based on the web-based archive and Program/Pathway Review Manual. Program review reports, reviewed at random, vary dramatically in quality, with some reports lacking reflection on or analysis of data included in the report.

The college disaggregates student achievement and learning outcomes data by course and instructional method. The College disaggregates student achievement data by major demographic characteristics of age, gender, and race/ethnicity. Other than in the Student Equity Plan, equity gaps are not analyzed beyond these categories. (I.B.5)

While student achievement data are disaggregated for all major measures in the SEMP, discussion of equity gaps occurs only in the Student Equity Committee. (I.B.6)

The college conducted an employee Campus Climate Survey in fall 2015, which gathered feedback on topics such as governance processes, planning priorities, and participation.

The College Planning Council approved formation of Planning Task Group to review planning & program review processes. The Planning Task Group piloted a new data repository and reporting system, the HAPS, to support assessment and unit planning. The Participatory Governance Agreement indicates that collegial consultation committees conduct self-evaluations on a regular basis. However, no consistent practice of self-evaluation was determined. In addition, no regularly-scheduled campus-wide evaluations of processes were indicated, including learning outcomes assessments and integrated planning processes. (I.B.7)
The College utilized Harbor Success Days and accreditation processes to share information with entire campus. Shared governance processes are used to communicate college assessment and evaluation. Committees at which data were most often discussed include the Academic Senate, VP-area Cluster Committees, College Planning Council, and Student Success Coordinating Council. Minutes of selected shared governance committees are distributed to the entire workforce via email to ensure that activities of these bodies may be widely known. Committee representatives also have standing report items on other committee agendas. While some meeting minutes did not always capture the full dialog on assessment and evaluation, many members of the college community confirmed that this dialog is a robust, if new, process. The HAPS webpage has centralized meeting minutes, data, and documentation of college processes. (I.B.8)

The college is in the midst of enhancing existing planning processes to be based more on evidence, ensure greater integration, and link to the mission and institutional improvement. In 2015, the college established institutional goals aligned with District goals and set objectives and measures for each goal as its Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). The college uses a thorough process for the prioritization of faculty hires that includes a comprehensive request form that relies on enrollment and other data, program review findings, and other pertinent information. The initial prioritization process is conducted by the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC), a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The FHPC prioritization process utilizes a rating process based on the position identification form.

With respect to Unit Plan and other resource allocations, program review appears to be present as a source of evaluation and decision-making. Program reviews exist in an online archive; but it is unclear whether or not the practice of comprehensive program review will continue and feed into planning and decision-making processes. The HAPS pilot was originally dubbed Program Review 2.0; however, because the term “program review” was deemed unpalatable, it was renamed “Unit Planning.” However, the Unit Planning module within HAPS is not a comprehensive program evaluation tool as is the current program review template. While a history of program reviews was documented, individual reports varied widely in quality, with some programs analyzing and discussing supporting data, while others included the data but did not discuss them. (I.B.9)

**Conclusions:** The College meets this Standard.

**Recommendations for Compliance:** none

**Recommendations for Improvement**

In order to increase institutional effectiveness and address existing equity gaps, the team recommends that learning outcomes be disaggregated to at least the program (PLO) and institutional (ISLO) levels, and that these data be used for continuous improvement. (I.B.2, I.B.6, I.B.9)

**Standard I.C  Institutional Integrity**

**General Observations**

LAHC uses a printed catalog and a printed schedule in addition to the website to provide information to the campus and the public. Student Learning Outcomes are mapped and recorded on HAPS.
Findings and Evidence

The college delivers information to students through print publications, the college website, and through social media. Information is delivered via the web through student-centered pages; pages are fresh in appearance and are easy to navigate. The print catalog is updated every two years, while the online catalog is revised as needed to ensure that the most current policies and information are available to students. The college has a specific process and an assigned officer in Academic Affairs for the dissemination of information to students and the community. (I.C.1, I.C.2)

The HAPS is the repository for student learning outcomes assessments. Course-level SLOs are mapped to PLOs and, in turn, to ISLOs. Quality is communicated through standardized reports of the HAPS which indicate the number of course SLOs that meet performance benchmarks by associated PLOs and ISLOs. HAPS summary reports are available on the college’s public webpages. (I.C.3)

Degrees and certificates are described in detail in the college’s catalog, both online and in print. The online version is updated as needed to reflect current description of programs. Program learning outcomes are published with each degree, with links to course SLOs also provided. PLOs for certificates were not published. In the fall 2015, the Curriculum Committee held workshops to facilitate review of degree and certificate programs. Modifications made as a result of these workshops have been updated to the online catalog. (I.C.4)

Where applicable, the college applies policies and procedures adopted by the District. The college has an opportunity to provide input on changes to policies when they come up for review. Academic Affairs coordinates the review of policies and procedures in preparation for the publication of the biannual catalog. As noted in I.C.4., the college coordinated a number of discipline-specific workshops to facilitate updating of program information in the online catalog.

Outside of District and curriculum and student/academic policies, the status and process of review policies was unknown by a large number of campus representatives. A list of local policies and procedures and a policy review calendar were not found. The college acknowledged that policies, procedures, manuals, and publications likely are in need of review and revision, and, therefore, have included a comprehensive review process as a part of its Quality Focus Essay under “Formalize College communications. (I.C.5)

The college publishes the total cost of education in the schedule of classes each semester. (I.C.6)

Policy on academic freedom and responsibility is covered under LACCD District policy and is clearly communicated in the College catalog and Faculty collective bargaining agreement. The policy applies regardless of the instructional delivery mode. (I.C.7)

The college applies ASCCC Code of Ethics and Board Rule 9803 on academic honesty. These are published in the Faculty Handbook, catalog, and schedule of classes. Academic honesty policies are presented and discussed during probationary faculty orientations.

LA Harbor faculty follow the AAUP position on professional ethics, as published in the Faculty Handbook. (I.C.8, I.C.9)

LA Harbor College has no foreign operations. (I.C.10, I.C.11)
The College made public all documents related to the accreditation visit on a SharePoint-based Accreditation Steering site. While all data supporting the Accreditation Self-Evaluation was published through this SharePoint site, webpages containing older information (meeting minutes, etc.) remained live, leading to confusion and difficulty finding appropriate documents on the part of the visiting team. The college may consider removing links to all older sites and shift all documents to the SharePoint site. (I.C.12)

Through its historical documents on accreditation, the College has shown a commitment to addressing recommendations thoughtfully. In addition to existing internal mechanisms for review that include the collegial College Planning Council, the college benefits from oversight review conducted on the part of the District office. (I.C.13)

College goals are related to student achievement & learning, as documented in the SEMP and mission statement. (I.C.14)

Conclusion: The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations for Compliance: none

Recommendations for Improvement: none

From the District Team

I.C.7 Policies on academic freedom

General Observations

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.”

Findings and Evidence

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. (I.C.7)

Conclusions

The District meets the Standard 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.

I.C.8 Policies that promote honesty, academic integrity

General Observations
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.

Findings and Evidence
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 are required to include an expectation of academic integrity for students in their class syllabi. (I.C.8)

Conclusions
Los Angeles Community College District meets the Standard. 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.
STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Standard IIA: Instructional Programs

General Observations:

Los Angeles Harbor College provides an array of instructional programs for students seeking transfer, general education, basic skills, career and technical education, and noncredit coursework. The College offers 43 degrees in associate of arts, associate of science, and associate degrees for transfer; and 26 certificates of achievement. The College has thirteen AA-T and AS-T degree patterns that are conducted at an appropriate level for higher education.

The College offers three degrees completely online: Fire Technology, Business, and Administration of Justice. The College’s faculty, along with the support of the Distance Education Committee, choose the fields of study in which it offers DE programs. Every faculty member teaching online is required to complete training in the College’s LMS. Some faculty also use blogs that are external to the LMS. Some programs offer hybrid courses. PACE, for example, offers the entire program in hybrid mode. A number of courses are web-enhanced.

The Accrediting Team found limited evidence of there being a cohesive and coherent effort to establish measures of student success in DE, to define and systematically assess regular and effective contact, and to align DE with professional development, SSSP, culturally responsive training, equity, and other similar resources on other support services on campus.

Only 10.3% of the College’s students benefit from DE courses and programs. The Accrediting Team found limited evidence that DE courses and programs have been assessed to determine if/how DE is meeting students’ needs (particularly in offering the appropriate number of courses and programs, in providing robust learning support services, in meeting the needs of students’ learning styles, in establishing regular and effective contact, in complying with ADA, and in determining if a Substantive Change is needed for delivering GE courses online).

The College defines standards for student achievement and assesses performance against those standards. All courses in all delivery modes have defined Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that are assessed regularly, and that are included in all syllabi.

The College is now engaged in redesigning and putting into action a systematic data-driven assessment process that reflects an ongoing cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation that informs decisions including in teaching and student success: Harbor’s Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS). This new process, which includes assessment of instructional programs and SLOs, is a third iteration of the old process, and the last component, the re-evaluation, is yet to be done.

The College has chosen “student completion” as the focus for the 2016 self-evaluation Quality Focus Essay (QFE).
Findings and Evidence

The College provided evidence that instructional programs are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution’s mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, degrees, certificates, employment or transfer.

The College’s instructional programs are defined by the goals of higher education and support the College’s mission to “promote access and student success through associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and basic skills instruction.”

The College offers three completely online (and substantive change proposal ACCJC approved) degrees in business, administration of justice, and fire technology. In fall 2015, only 10.3% of the students were enrolled in DE courses; 77.4% were enrolled in face-to-face courses; and 12.3% were enrolled in both online and face-to-face courses.

Some programs, such as PACE, examine anecdotal evidence about the needs of their students, and determine to offer their courses in hybrid mode. (II.A.1, ERs 9, 11)

The College provided evidence that the full-time and part-time faculty ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations, and that they work continuously to improve courses, programs and directly related services by systemic evaluation to assure currency in teaching and student success.

The College hires all faculty members based on their qualifications and teaching expertise in specific disciplines. Faculty submit course outlines and are regularly evaluated on “academic and professional matters” defined by the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Article 2, Sections 53200 and 53201 (also known as the “10 + 1”). (II.A.2)

Currently, instructional programs assess Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) by determining whether a student completing degree programs achieve all of the college's institutional learning outcomes. Certificate programs define the appropriate learning outcomes and assess if the outcomes were achieved.

With respect to program review, the College follows a 6-year comprehensive program review process. A review of these documents, title “Unit Plans”, demonstrates that programs address the criteria of relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future. A Program Review Committee charged with examining the Unit Plans might create consistency and specificity in responses from the various programs. With the advent of HAPS, the College has not yet reconciled how the 6-year comprehensive program review results are and will be used in institutional planning.

Faculty assess course SLOs to insure that course outlines, instructional methods, and course content are sound. During their first year of hire, faculty participate in a year-long orientation. Beyond that first year, faculty participate in professional development activities, and in professional organizations. The College supports a Teaching Learning Center (TLC) to encourage all faculty and staff to remain current in the use of technology in the classroom. The Distance Education Committee meets regularly to discuss new developments and to provide technical and other support for instructors and courses delivered in DE, hybrid, and web-enhanced modes.
Competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for DE and hybrid courses are determined by faculty, with advisory committees such as the DE Committee, following the same processes and standards applied to face-to-face courses. Faculty discuss the relationship between the selected teaching methodologies and student performance in DE courses as they apply to and may differ from face-to-face courses. The Accreditation Team found limited evidence that such discussions are inclusive of all courses in all disciplines and programs, or that methodologies and DE-specific pedagogies are being discussed and applied at an institutional level. The Accreditation Team also found evidence to show that data-driven assessment and follow-through is not uniformly being applied to evaluate the performance of DE courses and programs and the requirement to incorporate regular and effective contact. Although data for DE courses are disaggregated, some programs, for example, PACE, are not using those data to determine the courses’ and program’s implementation and progress.

The Accreditation Team found limited that not all instructional programs are consistently assessing their PLOs using data-driven criteria.

The College provided evidence that it identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. When assessment results warrant improvement, faculty develop responsive strategies. Students receive course syllabi that include learning outcomes.

Observation of teaching a face-to-face English 101, and two completely online courses (Service Learning 100 and Sociology 001), as well as review of sample syllabi both face-to-face and online classes (e.g., English 21 Fundamentals, Health 2 Fitness and Wellness, Economics 1 Microeconomics, PSY 001 General Psychology I, Administration of Justice 001, and Counseling 020), indicate that courses include officially approved and current outlines with Student Learning Outcomes, and that students receive course syllabi that include those student learning outcomes.

The SLO Coordinator and faculty members identify and align learning outcomes at the (face-to-face and online) course, program and institutional levels. During fall 2015, all course, program and institutional goals were integrated into the new Harbor’s Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS). HAPS is a new process (and the third iteration of the old process), and the last component, the re-evaluation, is yet to be done.

The Accreditation Team found evidence to indicate that the institution offers DE courses and programs (for example, PACE) following established data-driven procedures, criteria, assessments, and outcomes but that they need to be applied uniformly. (II.A.3)

Consistent with its mission, the institution offers pre-collegiate courses to support students seeking preparedness for college level courses. The institution offers pre-collegiate level curriculum in English, English as a Second Language, mathematics, learning skills, and learning foundations. The course numbering system utilized by the College distinguishes pre-collegiate from College level studies, and the sequencing charts located in the catalog and class schedule establish the transition from pre-collegiate to college level courses. The College also distinguishes its pre-collegiate level curriculum in the course outline of record by requiring that the college curriculum be identified as eligible for transfer credit.
The college has moved to create pathways to student success by scheduling and evaluating course sequencing in order to meet student need and speed time to completion. The Math department, for example, added two classes that shorten the developmental math pathway, and they developed a math course for non-math majors which students can take in place of the three-course pathway to College level statistics. (II.A.4)

The institution’s degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The College adequately lists and meets the minimum of 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate degree requirement level. The evidence examined, such as the 2014-2016 Los Angeles Harbor College General Catalog and the college website, demonstrate that programs require minimum credits and that the college meets this standard. Another supporting document is the Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the Program and Course Approval Handbook 5th edition. (II.A.5, ER12, federal regulation)

The institution schedules courses to determine the best possible sequence of course offerings for student completion. Curriculum mapping ensures that courses are offered in sequence to enable students to progress within a period of time that is consistent with the expectations of program completion or transfer readiness. Faculty and administrators in each division collaborate to create schedules in which most courses are offered every semester or on an alternate semester basis, depending on demand. Sequencing is evaluated according to a six-year plan to meet students’ needs and to minimize the potential cancellation of more advanced courses that may evidence lower enrollment. (II.A.6, ER9)

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

The College offers courses during daytime, evening, and on Saturdays, as well as in on-campus and online modes (using the password-protected Etudes LMS). The College provides basic skills courses, all major and general education courses required for associate’s degrees, for transfer, and for major programs.

The College addresses student access, equity and success in other ways as well. Evidence gathered while attending a meeting of the College President’s Cabinet indicates that:

- Last spring semester the College started CHAMPS, a student success support program for student athletes that aims to broaden student athletes’ interaction with coaches, faculty, staff and other support programs, to decrease the percentage of student probation status, and to increase the percentage of student participation in orientation, counseling, course completion, and retention and transfer rates.
- In March 2016 the College was notified that it is being considered for a Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (DHSI) $2.6 million grant, disbursed through five years, to commence 1 October 2016.
To date, over 110 faculty, staff, and administrators members have attended Culturally Responsive Training (CRT) developed at LAHC and now used as a model at other institutions.

The College offers professional training to help faculty meet accessibility standards; it participates in Achieving the Dream (ATD).

The College has developed data-driven equity intervention programs.

Only 10.3% of the College’s students benefit from DE courses and programs. The Accrediting Team found limited evidence that DE courses and programs have been assessed to determine if the appropriate number of DE courses and programs are being delivered to meet the needs of students. (II.A.7)

Both English and Math use department-wide tests to assess prior learning. The English department has historically administered exit exams in English 21 and 28 which help to determine passage to the next level. These tests have not been recently validated. English department meeting minutes document that faculty have agreed to temporarily suspend use of these exit exams due to concerns about student success and progression rates. In the event that the English department wishes to reinstate the examination process in the future, selected instruments and scoring rubrics should be systematically evaluated for validity, reliability, disproportionate impact, bias. (II.A.8)

The institution awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. Per the LACCD Administrative Regulation E-97 Scheduling of Breaks, Instruction and Passing Time, the College schedules courses in compliance with Title 5, California Code of Regulations (Division 6, Chapter 9 – “Fiscal Support”, Subchapter 1 – “Attendance”) and the California Community Colleges’ Student Attendance Accounting Manual. Where state licensure requirements mandate clock hours for completion, the College follows federal standards for clock-to-credit hour conversions. The State Chancellor’s Office Program And Course Approval Handbook, 5th edition, is one piece of evidence used for determining course units versus hours, i.e. Carnegie formula. The approval of the programs and active courses is verified by the California Community College (CCC) State Chancellor’s Office Curriculum Inventory of Active Courses. Also all associate degrees and certificates of achievement meet the standards set forth in Title 5 as they are also approved by the California Community College (CCC) Chancellor’s Office as seen on the CCC Curriculum Inventory of Active Courses. (II.A.9)

The College made available documents that authenticate its claim that it establishes articulation agreements with public and private institutions and that it provides pathways to educate students about transfer and how courses articulate to institutions identified. These agreements can be found in discipline course outlines and program pathways, the Handbooks for California Articulation Policies and Procedures, and the LAHC College Catalog. Various AA/AS-transfer and articulation materials can be found in the College’s Transfer and Articulation Center, as well as worksheets related to transfer to the CSU, UC and other institutions. (II.A.10, ER 10)

The College provided evidence that institutional student learning outcomes address communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical
reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives. Each institutional learning outcome is mapped to program learning outcomes and course level outcomes. The college also conducted a student survey in Fall 2014 where the majority of student respondents (76.7%) indicated awareness of program learning outcomes.

The College offers associate’s degrees that align with the commonly accepted program length of 60 semester credit hours, in compliance with federal regulations. This is also codified in LACCD Board Rule 6201.10. The LAHC Curriculum Committee Mission and Functions also outlines its role and responsibility in the “creation, modification, and deactivation of program awards (degrees and certificates) and courses.” (II.A.11), federal regulation

The College requires of all degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for associate degrees. The general education courses are clearly stated in its catalog, both in print and online, and comply with commission policies, ER 12 and are supported by LACCD Board Rule 6201.14 General Education Requirement. LAHC has four options for general education plans; courses for inclusion are determined by the college’s Curriculum Committee and satisfy criteria set forth in the Curriculum Committee Guidelines, sections VII.A-C and include a student’s preparation for participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad approach to the development of knowledge in the areas of arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. The policies also ensure that courses accepted from other institutions meet emphasis equivalency. The College has also mapped their General Education Learning Outcomes, also referred to as Institutional Learning Outcomes, by discipline to demonstrate how many courses address each outcome. As a means for evaluation, the College uses the results of the LACCD bi-annual Student Survey results to evaluate effectiveness. In Fall 2014, almost 80% of LAHC students indicated that their experiences at LAHC improved their abilities to earn a broad general education by “Very Much/Quite a Bit”.

With respect to distance education offerings, the college submitted a substantive change proposal in 2009 for three programs proposed to be offered online. Because the college currently offers a significant number of general education courses online, per the Winter and Spring 2016 Schedule of Classes, it might be appropriate for the College to evaluate the need for a substantive change application in the future. A member of the Distance Education committee serves on the Curriculum Committee, per the Committee Policies and Procedures. (II.A.12, ER 12)

All LAHC degrees include general education requirements as well as a set of core course requirements which focus on the discipline or field of study. This requirement is documented per LACCD Board Rules 6201.10, 6201.13 and 6201.14. The College offers 43 degrees in associate of arts, associate of science, and associate degrees for transfer; and 26 certificates of achievement. All degrees have published program student learning outcomes which are available in the online college catalog. Up to and including Spring 2014, program SLO assessment was conducted and documented on the college’s accreditation website in a largely paper-based format. Subsequent to Spring 2014, the College embarked on the evaluation of their processes and mapped each course SLO to a program SLO. Results of course SLO assessment are now used as one measure to evaluate mastery of key theories and practices within the field of study for each program. All data and plans are now available online in the College’s Sharepoint system. The implementation of the HAPS in Spring 2016 will
allow the College to address student achievement through College goals and objectives, identified in the SEMP (Strategic Educational Master Plan); however, robust program level assessment that has been documented and has led to implementation of a change and a re-evaluation of the process is currently uneven across the College. This could be addressed by identifying a method by which assessment at the program level will take place consistently across the campus to ensure that students are achieving mastery at the appropriate level of key theories and practices within the discipline.

(II.A.13, ER 11)

The College’s Self Study Report states that graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards as well as the preparation for external licensure and certification, and that the faculty and advisory committees help to identify the skills required for employment reflected in the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) of each course within the programs. Furthermore, the Self-Study Report also stated that Employment competencies are determined by licensure pass rate, employer satisfaction surveys, new graduate surveys, transfer rate to higher education and input from advisory boards. These statements were authenticated or verified by existing documents in the college’s self-study.

The Office of Workforce and Economic Development provided documents that show evidence that the Research and Planning Group (RP-Group) helps to conduct the necessary research of Graduates and Employers Satisfaction Surveys and sends results to the college. Aside from this survey, the Nursing program collects its own data on NCLEX pass rate as well as licensure data. This information is used as the basis for dialog among CTE, Workforce and Economic Development faculty and staff for the purpose of program improvement. (II.A.14)

LACCD Board Rule 6803.10 outlines the procedures and requirements for initiating and conducting a viability review of educational programs. The language in the board rule addresses the need to consider impact on enrolled students. Per the Board Rule, the College President and President of the Academic Senate make recommendations for program discontinuance to the Board of Trustees for approval. The College also utilizes the 2012 statewide academic senate “Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective Revisited” publication as a guide for this process. The last LAHC program discontinuance was a two-year process initiated in 2003 for the Automotive program. At that time, the program was experiencing an enrollment decline and per the board rule process the College appropriately examined the options available district-wide for impacted students and considered options to minimize disruptions in their learning. (II.A.15)

The College provided evidence of identified student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level. At the course level, regular and systematic evaluation is ongoing using the Nichols’ Five Column Model. These course level assessments are then mapped to identified program and institutional outcomes. The College also maintains a 6 year comprehensive program review cycle. An example of how the results of program evaluation are used in institutional planning is the hiring of full-time faculty. This process is outlined in the FHPC Request for Position and requires completion of a variety of data-points including enrollment, relevance to program, alignment to student success initiatives and program review.
The college also underwent an evaluation of its processes following the 2012 self-evaluation results and identified a need to address recommendations in the areas of program review, planning, and SLO expectations in combination with new accountability measures at the state level. An evaluation of the program review cycle in 2013 resulted in a revision to the college mission (2014-15) and a new strategic educational master plan, which was approved by the board in spring 2015. The College then embarked on a pilot named Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS) that was implemented in summer 2015 and launched as a pilot in fall 2015. This demonstrates an effort being made to better align planning processes so that program review and the use of data will better affect institutional improvements. In addition, the 2014 Annual College Profile demonstrates that LAHC is using data to actively make an impact on institution-set standards. However, as the HAPS program was piloted in fall 2015 and implemented in Spring 2016, the College has not had the opportunity to evaluate its effectiveness.

In the HAPS system, distance education success rates and standards have been identified at the Unit Plan level and programs are in the process of evaluating these data. Programs that have not met identified targets are required to submit a plan of action to address rate improvement. These plans will roll up through the Strategic Educational Master Plan pathway as a means of addressing the College goals. As the HAPS system was piloted in Fall 2015 and adopted in spring 2016, the College has not yet evaluated this change in procedure to determine effectiveness. (II.A.16, federal regulation).

Conclusions: The College meets the Standard and related eligibility requirements.

Recommendations for Compliance: none

Recommendations for Improvement:

1. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the assessment of outcomes should be used in planning for improvement regarding student success, strategic planning and institutional effectiveness. (II.A.3)

2. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the College strengthen its procedures, coordination, and assessment processes for the delivery of Distance Education courses and programs; that the College identify a standard for regular and effective contact and utilize that standard for evaluation of instruction; and that the College should conduct an inventory of the General Education courses it offers in Distance Education in order to determine if a Substantive Change is needed (II.A.3,II.A.16).

Standard II. B: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The college appears to be robust in its ability to identify leadership to evaluate library and learning support services and implement initiatives to serve student achievement and success.
The new library and learning support facility includes an area with computers, an area where students can study individually and in groups, an area for instruction, an area for tutoring, and the Learning Resources Center (LRC), the High Tech Center, the Writing and Math labs, and the Literacy Center (reading lab). This facility is an active locus for student learning and support.

Findings and Evidence

Because this facility is new and support services are expanded, a greater number of students are being served. For example, enrollments in Tutor I increased by 83% (542 actual enrollments during fall 2014). There are scheduled workshops, faculty members and librarians consult with students, online students can access EBSC)-e-books and other data bases. The LRC schedules ample hours of support as follows: 53 hours per week in math, 45 in basic skills, 36 hours per week in writing, and 26 hours per week for students with documented disabilities. (II.B.1, ER 17)

The College relies on faculty to select and maintain educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission. The Library actively seeks faculty input in order to acquire materials and equipment that support student learning and enhance the mission of the college. Faculty input is sought in the following ways:

1. Library representation on the curriculum committee
2. Discipline-specific library workshops
3. Direct notification to the campus of all new library acquisitions
4. Requests for recommendations for the purchase of new materials
5. Informal dialogue with faculty about their discipline’s needs for resources and materials

Examples of service enhancements that were implemented as a result of dialogue with faculty about the needs of students in their respective disciplines included the creation of a two-part workshop for psychology majors on conducting research and the literature review, and an online tutorial for history students on locating and evaluating sources.

The Library evaluates its effectiveness in meeting students’ learning needs by assessing Library workshops, tracking the quality and variety of citations by English, History, and Psychology students who have completed a library workshop, and informal quizzes in topic-specific workshops. The Library led the assessment of Institutional Outcome #3--Information Competency. The Library assesses the quality of services and workshops for distance education students, as well as for students in traditional courses. (II.B.2)

The library faculty contribute to the attainment of learning outcomes. For example, in collaboration with the English department and Honors Transfer program, the library has identified the development of a high quality bibliography as a student learning outcome in Library Science 101: Library Research Methods course, a 1.0 unit UC/CSU transfer course. Assessment reports indicate that students enrolled in this course achieve this SLO at high rates. This collaboration has evolved into requiring all Honors Transfer program students to complete Library Science 101. Ongoing communication between the library faculty and other discipline faculty appears to be robust and responsive.
Once the HAPS system completes a full cycle of assessment, including evaluation of the process, the library will be able to utilize a richer data set to analyze how the library and learning support services areas can continue to address the growing needs pertaining to student achievement and completion rates. (II.B.3)

The LAHC library and learning resource center engages with other sources to provide resources or learning support services for its instructional programs and documents that these formal agreements exist. These resources are accessible to students both remotely and on campus. The library website makes clearly available the online resources such as library databases, e-reserves, and research guides. The “Guides on the Side”, available on the library main page, serves as the online library orientation for all students, including students enrolled in online courses. Upon completion of the orientation, students complete a post-test on the material covered and may then receive a certificate of completion. Results of the post-test are emailed to the Library Chair and used in program planning of the library. Library database subscription usage reports indicate that resources address the needs of students seeking transfer, general education, career and technology training, and basic skills, in alignment with the college mission. The library has also contracted with Questionpoint to provide 24/7 reference desk services via chat. This service is widely used and effective. The Learning Resource Center has engaged NetTutor to provide online tutoring services. NetTutor usage reports demonstrate that online tutoring services are available and are being used by students. Because access to NetTutor requires a separate email to an LRC staff member, this may explain the low usage rates; however, the effectiveness of this program is yet to be evaluated. The library website also maintains a satisfaction survey that all students are encouraged to take after receiving or accessing services from the library. Low response rates make it difficult to make generalizations regarding adequacy of service. However, the results of this tool as well as the library and LRC-focused questions on the LAHC Student Survey and the LACCD Student Satisfaction Survey confirm that resources and services are adequate for the institution’s purposes. Finally, a fulltime library faculty member serves on the Distance Education Committee to ensure that the library and learning resource services meet the needs of students. (II.B.4, ER17)

**Conclusions:** The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

**Recommendations for Compliance:** None

**Recommendations to Improve Quality:**

1. In order to improve the Standard, the team recommends that the College make full use of the newly implemented HAPS system in order to continue to explore and evaluate the processes by which assessment of services and resources are conducted for the purpose of continuous improvement. (II.B.3)
Standard II.C. Student Support Services

General Observations

In General, the College provides varied and robust student services to both on-campus students and the distance education population. These services are assessed and there is evidence that improvements have been made based on those assessments. Counseling may be the exception in that, while the College offers call-in or chat options, full on-line counseling services are not yet available. The College has participated in the new HAPS process and it is anticipated that this process will increase the College’s ability to gather, compile and use data to improve student achievement.

Findings and Evidence

The College’s recent adoption of a new assessment-based planning model has impacted all units and programs, including Student Services. The student services units participated in the new HAPS process as recently as fall 2015. Under the new planning process, service outcomes are developed to meet the institutional goals described in the SEMP. The institutional benchmark also serves as the program-level benchmark. Unit-level improvements are made based on the alignment of program goals and SEMP. Program-level action plans are developed to meet the SEMP benchmark (II.C.1, ER 15).

Examples of student services assessments include CalWORKS Workshop Evaluations, Transfer Fair Evaluations, a DSPS student satisfaction survey, and a survey assessing the impressions of transfer representatives. Dialogue about the Institution-Set Standards and student services assessments occur in the Student Success Coordinating Committee, the Student Services Managers meeting, and in department and dean’s meetings (II.C.1).

Service Area Outcomes have been identified for student services units, and improvement strategies have been logged for the past three years. The College has recently aligned the HAPS process with SEMP to achieve better planning alignment throughout the institution. For example, data considered during the outcomes assessment process included the correlation of CHAMPS data with Achieving the Dream data, and the fall-to-spring persistence rates of Harbor Advantage students compared to students not enrolled in this first-year experience program. Student equity data prompted the development of the Puente student mentoring program and an Umoja program to increase achievement outcomes for African American students (II.C.2).

The College provides distance education instructional offerings to approximately ten percent of LA Harbor College students. The support services however, are not yet consistently available in an online format, although the College is taking steps to improve their quantity and quality. All the student services unit websites include department contact information and resource lists. Many contain links to internal and external resources, as well. The College’s student services units have many online resources, such as the College Catalogue and schedule, Frequently Asked Questions
(FAQs), the ability to schedule a counseling appointment, health and wellness resources, and articulation information. New student orientations are conducted online using a Prezi presentation with a comprehension quiz, although a new, fully online orientation is being planned.

Students are required to complete an education plan during their first year of college. To assist students in career decision-making, counselors offer workshops, visit classrooms, and coordinate career-focused events. The College contacts students via SARS e-blast and SARS call to notify them of application deadlines and other important college information (II.C.5). The College orientation process is an online Prezi presentation with a comprehension quiz. Counseling for distance education students is accomplished without a formal platform, via email. The counselor requires the student to provide information to authenticate his/her identity before discussing confidential matters (II.C.3, ER 15).

The College offers a broad range of counseling and support services to the diverse LAHC student population, including special services for economically disadvantaged students, foster youth, athletes, first-generation college students, students with physical or learning disabilities, and those with mental health challenges. A college-wide plan is in place to address disproportionate impact among African American, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, and female students. Services and instructional support in the LAHC Student Equity Plan include counseling for military veterans, supplemental instruction for pre-collegiate mathematics and English, a new Umoja program, and programs for first-year and sophomore students (II.C.3, ER 15).

While many student services units have online resources and services available to students, online counseling is not yet uniformly developed and implemented, which may make it difficult for the ten percent of LA Harbor College students enrolled in distance education class to access educational planning. (II.C.3)

The College has a vibrant and engaged Associated Student Organization which sponsors several activities that celebrate diversity. Student senators represent their constituency by serving on participative governance groups. The College also provides clubs for students with diverse backgrounds and interests.

To improve teaching, learning, and services for diverse students, the College has implemented Culturally Responsive Training (CRT). CRT is an intensive workshop designed to promote cultural awareness and to increase the understanding and appreciation of diversity. The program has also been offered to students, staff, faculty, and administrators, and has been in demand by other LACCD colleges (II.C.4).

The College closely monitors the budgets of the athletics program and the Associated Students Organization (II.C.4).

The College has twelve full-time counselors, all of whom are evaluated pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement. To ensure they acquire accurate college information, new tenure-track counselors and adjunct counselors shadow an experienced counselor, and they are mentored throughout the year until they are ready to work independently. The Counseling Department meets regularly to review processes and information to ensure the accuracy of information given to students (II.C.5).
To ensure that accurate information is given to students, the College counseling unit holds division meetings and trainings throughout the year. EOPS counselors meet the special minimum qualifications required of EOPS faculty, and they maintain professional currency by attending the state and local EOPS trainings. Adjunct counselors are trained individually and in groups. Counseling Assistants and Interns receive specialized trainings. Interns are mentored by a full-time counselor, guided by the Counseling Intern Orientation Workbook. Student workers receive training prior to their employment, and more comprehensive training is provided throughout the year. Financial aid staff have been trained to review educational plans for financial aid eligibility, and to help students with debt/default management, and financial literacy. In order to improve and increase effectiveness in serving student equity, the College may wish to expand the online counseling process to better serve its distance education students (II.C.5).

Admission policies are consistent with Title 5. They are published in the catalog and in the schedule of classes. Degree and certificate requirements and program qualifications are listed in the college catalog, and general education patterns (A,B,IGETC, and CSU GE) are listed on the college website, in the catalog, and on advisement sheets. New students can use the computers in the Career/Transfer Center to complete their admissions and financial aid applications (II.C.6, ER 16).

A district committee evaluates admissions practices and tools. In addition, campus student success initiatives are vetted and coordinated through SSSP, Student Equity, and Student Success Coordinating Committee. Validation of the college’s assessment instruments are conducted in accordance with state guidelines every six years, and include consequential validity, content review, cut score validation, and disproportionate impact (II.C.7).

Policies and procedures are in place regarding maintenance of records, and are monitored by the College and the District Admissions and Records Offices, which collaborate closely on policy interpretation and implementation. Access to student records is carefully restricted via an authorization process involving multiple levels of the institution, based on the job description/scope of work. Assessment results are also maintained in a secure database. Some records prior to 1984 are held on microfiche. District policy allows students to order and/or inspect their records (II.C.8).

Conclusions

Service units have developed outcomes and, with the implementation of the new HAPS, have begun to assess them systematically. Dialogue about the improvements made as a result of assessments takes place in a variety of functional and governance bodies. The new process links unit-level planning to institutional outcomes. Additionally, some programs have conducted unit-level assessments to better understand the improvements needed within the department. However, because the HAPS process is in the beginning stages, some units have not completed the assessment cycle. These units will need to continue to expand and strengthen their use of the full cycle. (II.C.3)

Recommendations for Compliance: none

Recommendations for Improvement:

1. In order to increase effectiveness and improve assessment of program and services, student service units should continue to assess program outcomes, and to use the resultant
information to improve services and support to students. All service units need to complete a full assessment cycle. (II.C.3)

From the District Team

II.C.6 Admissions policies

General Observations
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.

Findings and Evidence
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. (II.C.6)

Conclusions
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 polices 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.

Recommendations for Compliance: none

Recommendations for Improvement: none
II.C.8 Student records

General Observations

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

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). (II.C.8)

Conclusions

The District meets the Standard. 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.

**Recommendations for Compliance:** none

**Recommendations for Improvement:** none
Standard III: Resources

Standard IIIA: Human Resources

General Observations

Administrators, faculty and staff are qualified by education, training, and experience. Job announcements for all openings include minimum qualifications as well as any additional skills or experience necessary to support programs and services. Job descriptions reflect position duties, responsibilities and authority. (III.A.1)

Faculty are involved in the development of faculty job descriptions. Hiring criteria for faculty positions are determined in collaboration between the dean, the division chair and the discipline faculty; discipline faculty are involved in the screening and selection process. Additionally, positions that require experience with distance education include a notice of required training or experience in the job description, and at least one member of the hiring committee will have experience with online pedagogy. The institution ensures the qualifications of faculty, staff, and administrators by relying on college committee oversight during the screening process and by adhering to district Human Resource policies. (III.A.1)

The job announcements for all openings include minimum qualifications as well as any desirable qualifications that support the responsibilities of the position. Postings for full time faculty positions include curriculum development and the assessment of student learning either as a component of the description or listed under Duties and Responsibilities. Faculty qualifications and requisite skills receive scrutiny throughout the screening and selection process. (III.A.2)

The institution has established internal written procedures governing the selection of academic administrators. All candidates must meet Academic Service minimum qualifications consistent with Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges. Additionally, the institution requires all administrators and others who are responsible for educational programs and services to meet prior experience within the service area. To sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality, Academic administrators are encouraged to participate in ongoing professional development opportunities presented through the district Human Resource Division. (III.A.3)

The institution requires that degrees held by faculty and administrators be from accredited institutions recognized by a U.S. accrediting agency. Applicants who possess degrees from non-U.S. institutions are directed to have their transcripts evaluated by an approved foreign transcript evaluation service. (III.A.4)

The college has established evaluation processes for all college employee groups. Each employee bargaining unit has codified process and criteria in the collective bargaining agreement. (III.A.5) Evaluations for faculty are administered in accordance with the provisions stipulated by the collective bargaining agreement. The administration of these evaluations is managed by the college. Evaluations for Vice Presidents are conducted annually every spring. The Human Resources Division provides the forms and completion timelines to the college presidents. Evaluations for Senior Executives are administered by Human Resources, in conjunction with the Office of the Chancellor. (III.A.5)
Assessment of student learning is a component of faculty evaluations, and the results of that assessment influence professional dialogue about effective teaching and learning. The evaluation process provides opportunity to analyze faculty performance and to establish improvement goals for the next evaluation cycle. Discipline faculty use assessment results to propose curricular or instructional changes in order to promote student success. (III.A.6)

The District Team noted that SLOs are not incorporated into the evaluation of academic administrators.

The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified full-time and part-time faculty to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities. The institution relies on systematic planning processes to identify and prioritize new faculty positions, as well as staff. The planning initiated at the department level identifies the need for new positions. Requests for new faculty and staff positions are forwarded through the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee and the Human Resources Committee (HR) to the College Planning Committee for recommendation to the college president. (III.A.7)

The institution provides multiple points of engagement for part time and adjunct faculty. The District website offers a general interactive new faculty orientation. A newly revised Faculty handbook summarizes many essential topics such as course preparation, professional rights, responsibilities, and ethics, and College resources. Adjunct faculty are provided an orientation presentation in the beginning of each fall semester during Professional Development days, and the respective division chairs also provide a basic College orientation upon assignment to the College. (III.A.8)

The institution has sufficient staffing levels distributed throughout the different professional service areas. The institution employs an unduplicated headcount of 480 faculty and staff. (III.A.9) The institution maintains a sufficient number of administrators to meet the needs of the institution and to provide continuity in decision making and college planning and operations. The majority of the newly added administrative positions have been the result of its grants programs which require administrative oversight.

Although the college has experienced recent changes in academic leadership, the new administrators have both the academic credentials and experience to support the institution’s mission and purposes. (III.A.10)

The institution establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures. The institution also relies on the LACCD Division of Human Resources to provide access to personnel policies and procedures through a variety of formats, including those located on the district webpage. (III.A.11)

The institution supports diversity and equity in a variety of ways at the college and through the efforts of the LACCD. Culturally Responsive Training, a program originating at LAHC, is used on campus and is now being adopted at other colleges. (III.A.12) Ethical responsibilities are promoted in a variety of documents: the college catalog establishes expectations for students, the Faculty Handbook articulates behavioral expectations for all faculty relative to ethical responsibilities, and Board Rules establishes expectations for all other employees and the Board of Trustees. (III.A.13)

The institution provides a variety of professional opportunities for faculty and staff. The Professional Development Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, works in cooperation with the Staff Development Committee to create and promote opportunities for continuous learning and
professional growth. Additionally, faculty have access to multiple workshops focused on improving student achievement and learning outcomes. (III.A.14)

The institution makes provisions for the security of personnel files by maintaining confidential files in accordance with collective bargaining agreements. (III.A.15)

Findings and Evidence

College hiring priorities emerge from systematic planning processes, which assure a connection between college mission and resource allocation. The institution utilizes program review and planning processes to conduct a needs assessment and identify new faculty and staff positions. The Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC) reviews the requests for new faculty positions and submits a prioritized list to the Academic Senate for approval. The Human Resources Committee (HRC) reviews the requests for new staff positions and forwards a prioritized list to the College Planning Council. All new positions are approved by the college president. (III.A.1) (III.A)

District policy requires that all faculty and administrative hires meet the minimum qualifications for the instructional position or other academic field as prescribed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and California Education Code (HR R-100, HR R-110). Moreover, the college has the responsibility to establish, follow, and monitor recruitment and selection procedures in keeping with compliance reviews, recruitment activities and selection processes as defined in district policies and procedures (HR R-000, Human Resources Guide). (III.A.2)

Discipline faculty participation in the screening and selection process assures that candidates have adequate and appropriate knowledge of the subject matter. Selection committees may assess effectiveness in teaching through teaching demonstrations or skills demonstrations during the interview process. The Faculty Hiring Priorities Manual indicates that the interview process may include teaching demonstrations, written prompts, performance of skills or other simulated or real job duties relevant to the position. (III.A.2) More than 25% of the college’s academic administrators possess a doctorate degree; the remaining administrators meet the minimum qualification associated with the appropriate discipline. The qualifications include a master’s degree except in those disciplines where a master’s degree is not generally available or expected. (III.A.3)

The institution requires that degrees held by faculty and administrators be from accredited institutions recognized by a U.S. accrediting agency. Applicants who possess degrees from non-U.S. institutions are directed to have their transcripts evaluated by an approved foreign transcript evaluation service. (III.A.4)

Transcripts are evaluated at multiple levels, including college screening committees, and the District Office of Human Resources prior to employment. The District Academic Senate Equivalency Committee is responsible for maintaining lists of accredited colleges and universities. (III.A.4)

The college has established evaluation processes for all college employee groups. Each employee bargaining unit has codified process and criteria in the collective bargaining agreement. (III.A.5)

Evaluations for faculty are administered in accordance with the provisions stipulated by the collective bargaining agreement. The administration of these evaluations is managed by the college. Evaluations for Vice Presidents are conducted annually every spring. The Human Resources Division provides the forms
and completion timelines to the college presidents. Evaluations for Senior Executives are administered by Human Resources, in conjunction with the Office of the Chancellor. (III.A.5)

The Personnel Commission administers the performance evaluation process for probationary classified employees, and consistent with the Personnel Commission, Rule 702, the Human Resources Division administers the performance evaluation process for permanent classified employees. Instructions for permanent performance evaluation procedures are provided to supervisory personnel by the Human Resources Division. (III.A.5)

The Human Resources Division utilizes a web application with workflow to remind supervisors to complete evaluations for their direct reports. The District Evaluation Alert System (EASY) follows the organization structure at the college. The current programming includes alerts for all permanent classified employees and deans. (III.A.5)

In support of the colleges, the Human Resources Division acts as a resource to the supervisors and managers at every step of the evaluation process. The District Human Resources Division offers assistance to management on evaluation preparation, goal setting with employees, and work improvement plans. As a member of the Southern California Community Colleges Employment Relations Consortium, the Human Resources Division encourages managers and supervisors to participate in the various workshops on performance management. Most recently, the District and the faculty have negotiated mandatory training on evaluations to be held in the spring. (III.A.5)

Faculty participate in a variety of processes that allows them to utilize the assessment results to improve teaching and learning. Systematic planning processes allow departments to identify areas for improvement and to identify resources needed to meet student needs and improve instruction. (III.A.6)

The appropriate number of full-time faculty at Los Angeles Harbor College is determined by the state mandated Faculty Obligation Number (FON) and the Los Angeles Community College District. To meet FON requirements and ensure educational program and service integrity, as well as organizational planning functions, the institution monitors student enrollment to maintain an appropriate balance of full-time and part-time faculty. (III.A.7)

The College provides all part time and adjunct faculty the opportunity to integrate into campus life through participation in Professional Development Flex activities which take place annually before the start of the fall semester. All part time and adjunct faculty have the opportunity to participate as a presenter or as an attendee in any of the professional development activities that take place throughout the academic year. Moreover, the part time and adjunct faculty are invited to participate in shared governance activities, and they are also elected by their division members to serve on campus wide committees to further integrate these faculty into the life of the institution. (III.A.8)

Requests for new positions emerge from the college planning processes, and new positions are reflected in staffing plans. The Human Resources Committee (HRC) reviews the requests for new staff positions and forwards a prioritized list to the College Planning Council. Positions are prioritized for approval as funding allows. Staff are qualified by education, training, and experience. Job announcements for all openings include minimum qualifications as well as any additional skills or experience necessary to support programs and services. Job descriptions reflect position duties, responsibilities and authority. (III.A.9)
Administrative positions require all applicants to meet minimum qualifications, and nearly 30% of current administrators possess doctoral degrees. The current leadership demonstrates the ability to serve the college through their professional experience and expertise relative to the position. (III.A.10)

Information, such as but not limited to collective bargaining, faculty handbooks, hiring information, Board Rules governing employee relations, are all easily available through the district webpage. To promote ease of access to information about processes, policy and practices, the institution participates in the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) program. The college SPOC troubleshoots assignment and payroll related issues of academic, classified and unclassified employees at the college. (III.A.11)

The College has developed a Culturally Responsive Training program with the goals to include recognizing and enhancing existing strengths as accomplishments of ethnically diverse student populations (transformation); affirming the heritage, learning style, and home culture of learners (validating); developing intellectual, social, emotional, and political learning (comprehensive); and encompassing curriculum content, learning content, and classroom climate (multidimensional). It is a multi-faceted initiative engaging faculty, staff, administrators, and students in the recursive process of self-reflection, dialogue, change, and growth regarding cultural understanding and cooperation in order to actively address individual and collective self-awareness, attitudes, and beliefs, knowledge of others, and the skills need to implement new understandings through best practices of cultural competence. (III.A.12)

The District has initiated several programs including, Project Match, which prepares and recruits a diverse faculty pool familiar with and sensitive to the needs of the students and service community. The program pairs interns with faculty mentors from within the intern’s field. (III.A.12)

The recently adopted Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (9-30-15) contains procedures for the hiring of academic and classified staff that are sensitive to the needs of a diverse student population. The Plan is available on the District website and distributed to college and district constituent groups, including the Board of Trustees, College Presidents, academic senate presidents, and union representatives. (III.A.12)

The LACCD Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion is responsible for ensuring compliance with State and Federal laws, including providing oversight of any discrimination issues. (III.A.12)

The LACCD Academic Senate adopted a code of ethics from the American Association of University Professors, and that statement is published in the Faculty Handbook. Additionally, District employees who are not covered by the faculty code of ethics adhere to a code of ethics articulated in LACCD Board Rules (Ch. I-Article II-1204) (adopted:2-8-06). (III.A.13)

All employee collective bargaining agreements assure access to professional growth opportunities. The College offers faculty and staff development through a variety of committees and resources at the college and through the District. The Professional development committee is primarily responsible for determining the FLEX professional development schedule for faculty. This committee is responsible for tracking faculty hours for participation. The Professional development committee also recommends topics for future trainings or workshops. (III.A.14)
The Staff development committee has established annual planning goals. The committee also produces a calendar of events on campus, and recommends funding for classified staff to attend conferences or workshops off campus.

Funding for faculty is the responsibility of the Professional Growth Committee. (III.A.14) A review of the professional development FLEX calendar for August 2014 reveals an emphasis on pedagogy, program evaluation, college processes, personal enrichment and student interventions. Staff Development and FLEX Committees assess the professional development through standardized evaluation forms and use the results of that assessment to improve future offerings. (III.A.14)

Beyond FLEX, the institution promotes professional development through multiple sources periodically throughout the year. For example, the Teaching Learning Center offers workshops on incorporating and improving the use of classroom technologies. Staff development for classified employees has also been assured through the collective bargaining agreement (Article 17); additionally, classified staff and faculty have negotiated a tuition reimbursement program as incentive to continue in college or seek professional certification programs. (III.A.14)

The District provides trainings for various campus practitioners and is currently, through HR, implementing an eight-part training program for Deans that will lead to a more professional administrative corps. Through the Office of Diversity, the District also provides training for compliance issues and EEO oversight for hiring. Each of the colleges in the District provides training through the efforts of an on campus Professional Development coordinator, and through the various CBAs, sums of money are provided for individual professional development activities and continuing education. (III.A.14)

The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement. (III.A.14)

The LACCD Division of Human Resources is responsible for maintaining the official personnel file; the institution maintains a separate staff relations file in a secure location. Only the materials in the official personnel file maintained by the LACCD Division of Human Resources may be used in the District in any proceedings which affect the status of the employee. Collective bargaining agreements identify what content will be kept in the official personnel file, and the process by which employees are given access to the contents. (III.A.15)

Conclusions

The College has made an institutional commitment to professional development through the Strategic Educational Master Plan (Goal 3); however, to promote efficiency and coordinate efforts, the college needs to further develop that plan to promote a cohesive strategy for professional development. (III.A.14)
From the District Team

General Observations

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

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. (III.A.1)
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. (III.A.2 and 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. (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. (III.A.4)

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. (III.A.5)

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. (III.A.6)

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. (III.A.8)

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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (III.A.15)

Conclusions

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. (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. (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. (III.A.6)

**Recommendations for Compliance:** none

**Recommendations for Improvement:**

1. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the college should develop a comprehensive, integrated professional development plan that maximizes resources, coordinates efforts, and establishes a method by which the activities as well as the planning processes can be assessed to promote continuous improvement. (III.A.14, III.C.4)

**Standard IIIB: Physical Resources**

**General Observations**

The district and college have been afforded the ability to construct new buildings with three major bonds: A, AA and J. The Buildings are well constructed and designed and are conducive to a learning and working environment.

The college’s CORE committee is the primary guiding committee over the LA Harbor College infrastructure projects at the campus level. They make recommendations to the President who in turn submits the proposals to the District Construction Services. The Facilities department on campus provides a physically safe space for the campus and provides for additional security measures such as outdoor listening devices (phone). The LA County Sheriff Department provides for the security for the college by providing officers.

The CORE Committee on campus has significant input into the design of the buildings on the campus. These constituents make decisions on which project options will be moved forward to best fit the needs of the college and its programs and services.
The College uses the Annual Unit Planning process for each college unit including the facilities department. In this process, each area reviews its program needs, which may include equipment.

The District and College have comprehensive plans for long-range capital improvements. Since 2012 they have made good strides to tighten their construction programs to stay in budget, reduce change orders and ensure that closeout paperwork is completed. They are evaluating the total cost of ownership as new buildings are brought on line and are looking for efficiencies in maintenance and operations.

The District and the College collaborate to provide appropriate technology resources to the College. The intersection of the two, the Technology Planning and Policy Council, serves to coordinate the purchase, maintenance and availability of these resources. The DE Committee at the College reaches out to the various constituencies to ensure availability of needed resources.

Findings and Evidence

During previous audits, it was found that the LACCD paperwork had not been retained to show adequate controls on change orders, cost analysis and proper DSA closeouts. This has since been corrected as evidenced by the audits. The District Construction Services have now taken the lead for all construction projects larger than $125,000. Projects smaller than this are handled by the campus Facilities Manager.

The Vice President of Administrative Services and the Facilities Operations Manager walk the facilities to review the building for any safety or facilities concerns. The college facilities department does an annual facilities plan in which they evaluate the condition and needs of the college and make their cluster recommendations as evidenced by their annual plan. LACCD has facilities inspectors that also do random facilities evaluations.

Regular and timely evaluations are done for custodial spaces, maintenance performance and safety reviews as evidenced by the logs. The Los Angeles County Fire Department Business Plan is updated annually as required. To increase the safety further the College Facilities Manager goes above and beyond by delivering an additional copy to the local fire station as evidenced by the planning binders. There are also safety exercises of the local emergency services on campus. This is held to improve familiarity with the campus in the event of an emergency.

The Work Environment Committee (WEC) also meets and has open dialogue about the facilities and safety needs of the college as evidenced by the committee minutes. (III.B.1)

The college and district maintain a Five-Year Capital Construction Plan, the Space Inventory Plan, and the 5-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan. These are submitted to the district office for submission or entry into the state’s Fusion system. These plans evaluate FTES and other factors to determine facility needs and the infrastructure improvements.

The College Building Program Overview located on the college web page is a comprehensive analysis of each building, what stage it is in, and the costs associated with the project. The college has been able to modernize and expand due to the three bond measures that were passed. The CORE minutes provide evidence that the committee is reviewing and recommending construction plans that affect the campus programs and services. (III.B.2)

The college provides an annual Facilities Master Plan that has been incorporated into the Strategic
Educational Master Plan and Cluster process to support the facility’s needs. The Facilities Department is now using an electronic work order system to track all requests and maintain a collegial environment as evidenced by the work order log. The college Unity Planning process to request new equipment is still incomplete. The units are writing the plans, but the process to incorporate this into resource allocation has not yet been completed.

The District has an inventory policy of verification every three years. The federal asset requirement is to review every two years. There was no evidence that an inventory had been completed in the last three years. The college and district should develop a timeline to review the inventory processes in order to insure regular attention to this component. (III.B.3)

The district uses APPA to benchmark both their custodial and maintenance services. This benchmark shows the college is in a “critical” need of maintenance workers. Even with this rating, the staff are still keeping the buildings and grounds in good condition. They are evaluating the total cost of ownership as new buildings are brought on line and are looking for efficiencies in maintenance, operations, and custodial services as evidenced by the Comprehensive Plan for Total Cost of Ownership, LACCD, 3/20/13 and the “October 2011 Master Building Program Budget Plan”. (III.B.4)

**Conclusion**

There is evidence of broad discussions in the WEC about a variety of physical and safety issues. The student surveys have found that the physical condition of the buildings are satisfactory. The Facilities department is doing ongoing evaluations and planning of the college. The college meets the standard by assuring the safety of the physical safety with ongoing planning and input.

The LACCD’s and LAHC’s planning documents and the College Building Program Overview detail both show that the college meets the standard by planning and upgrading its facilities to meet the needs of the programs and services.

The college meets the standard by planning for its facilities improvements and maintenance in its Facility Master Plans annually. They plan their equipment purchases using their integrated Cluster process.

These plans lay out the long term vision and related expenses to support the institutional goals. The district has made great efforts to create total cost of ownership models and is looking into ways to improve efficiencies.

**From the District Team**

**III.B.1-4 Physical resources**

**General Observations**

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 March 6-10 2016
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. (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. (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. (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 (III.B.4)

Conclusions

The District meets the Standard. 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 the standard by planning for its facilities improvements and maintenance in its Facility Master Plans annually. They plan their equipment purchases using their integrated Cluster process.

These plans lay out the long term vision and related expenses to support the institutional goals. The district has made great efforts to create total cost of ownership models and is looking into ways to improve efficiencies.

Recommendations for Compliance: none

Recommendations for Improvement: none
Standard IIIC: Technology Resources

Findings and Evidence

The District provides the College’s standard contracts from which they can buy major software at a reduced rate. The District also provides enterprise-wide human resources, Student Information Systems, and fiscal systems. The District further offers network, web page, and web-based support.

The District and Colleges meet in the Technology Planning and Policy Council (TPPC) to discuss district-wide initiatives. This is a participatory council. The District Technology Directors meet as a group to develop standard protocols and share solutions (DTC).

The campus provides the campus support to the individuals and labs on campus. They use an online work order system to process the request. As technology expands into more areas, the demand on the IT department is increasing. They have allowed for Power Users to update software so that the instructional needs are met.

The student satisfaction survey, which contains a technology satisfaction component, indicates that the students are satisfied with the level of service they are receiving. (III.C.1)

An additional technology satisfaction survey is sent out by the IT department annually, tangential to the student satisfaction survey. This survey asks additional technology-centric questions pertaining to the overall satisfaction of IT services from students, faculty, and staff. This survey is done annually and informs the IT department about potential issues and needs of their constituents as it pertains to technology and technology-based services. This survey is used to inform the college’s IT technology plan.

The District TPPC sets the standards for infrastructure and equipment. The campus reviews these plans and priorities to submit an annual plan to be included in the Cluster process. These plans are reviewed by the administration cluster.

The DE committee is meeting and discussing issues related to the improvement of distance education. Further, the DE committee is having informed discussions with staff, faculty and, in particular the IT department, as it is planning to roll out a new state-mandated LMS, Canvas, which is planned for the Fall, 2017 semester. (III.C.2)

In order to strengthen and protect the integrity of data systems, it is recommended that the College and the District address the weaknesses of the SAP system. The visiting team learned that access into the system could be gained by multiple individuals using the same log-in. While the District does not feel that this is a significant security issue, it has warranted auditors to mention it three years in a row.

To protect the College, data backups are performed on a nightly basis. They have redundant servers on site and back power systems are being implemented. Periodic backups including options such as incremental and full backups, would be complemented by a periodic rotation of backup media (or transmission of backups) to an off-site/off campus facility of at least several miles from the campus in the event of a catastrophic event (e.g. earthquake, flooding, etc.).

The college uses Easy to Use Distance Education Software (ETUDES) for its online learning component. Etudes is responsible for the backup and maintenance of the LMS system off-campus. The college
provides several links on their DE website to support courses using Etudes including FAQs, a link to a video, and an email link to student academic counseling support.

Student surveys indicate that students are generally satisfied with the Wi-Fi available to them and that it is accessible and secure. However, it was indicated that the last technology survey was completed well over a year ago. It is recommended that the College schedule an annual technology needs and satisfaction survey that will inform IT of the needs, satisfaction, and maintenance requirements as viewed by the user community. The survey, again, will serve to inform IT planning and related budgeting. (III.C.3)

The faculty are provided instructional support through Teaching and Learning Center (TLC). The TLC surveys faculty needs, updates them on on-line offerings, and provides training on technology uses in the classroom on FLEX day. The online faculty are required to take an Etudes tutorial prior to teaching online and encourage the review of tutorials annually. Support personnel are provided training through district in-service training.

Staff are provided technology training through in-service training and from specific vendors. It was reported that Classified technology training was offered in the past, but due to low enrollment it is no longer being offered.

LAHC has a tutorial page for students on its webpage called Harbor Online. This page offers student resources to support them in using the online systems and supports. A student survey indicated that 48% do not know who to contact for email issues. The college has many online tutorials and videos about accessing the system. This gap is being addressed by ESC.

DE training is addressed by Article 40 in the FA contract (page 148). Supporting training for DE also includes video content and FAQs posted on the DE website. Training for DE is typically offered at the beginning of the Fall, Spring and Summer terms. Further, DE training is offered as FLEX units for faculty. Technology training for classified staff is limited, due to classified participation rates in offered training.

IT has allocated a non-instructional space for IT training, which will be brought online in the next 6 months that will support further training opportunities. (III.C.4)

The college’s Faculty Handbook outlines the attendance policy and required effective contact with students. The handbook also gives general guidance on college-wide technology process such as accessing rosters. The DE committee has the Distance Learning Manual that outlines the processes and procedures that online faculty must follow. All new hires must show some proficiency in technology. The TLC department helps the faculty with the technology in the classroom setting. (III.C.5)

**Conclusion**

The district and college both have technology committees that represent the governance structures evidenced by meeting minutes. Both the district and the college have Technology Plans. Campus Technology also writes an annual plan operationalizing the Technology Plan. While the staffing levels are not able to keep up with the fast demands placed on them, the college has allowed alternate methods, e.g. Power Users, to augment the process.
The Information Technology department reports that a consulting group will be used in the near future that will examine the usage of technology and infrastructure “fit” on campus. The consulting report should inform an update to the Technology Plan and should also identify key operational tasks and budget requirement necessary for IT improvement. While this consulting process is acknowledged as a best practice, it is important for the college to consider an external assessment of the IT environment as one of the key cornerstones to meet constituent needs and district needs while considering a district wide plan for disaster recovery. The TAC should be charged with overseeing implementation of the new Technology Plan, identifying annual and multi-year tasks for the campus with requests for budget augmentation and increased staffing to better support instruction, student learning, and support services on campus.

The College may wish to include information about the up-and-coming LMS (Canvas) on the Distance Education website. A link might be provided to videos, a sample Canvas shell that users (students, faculty, and the community) can visit/view, and a general roll-out schedule of Canvas for faculty, staff, and the community. Incorporation of social media into the DE website would provide students with relevant information about DE and online learning.

The Distance Education site might also incorporate more robust student support information including additional video content, the ability for students to have a chat session with an academic counselor (for cursory questions or for setting up a more in-depth meeting, etc.), frequent LMS training and the ability for students to self-schedule for these training sessions, and the inclusion of social media elements to promote and disseminate active information about the college’s DE program and LMS initiatives.

In student surveys the results are in general positive to updated software and wireless access. The college IT department backs up data nightly to ensure the safety of college information.

The TLC is providing faculty with opportunities to learn and incorporate technology into their classroom and curriculum as evidenced on the webpage offerings. Faculty have the ability to enhance their skill by using the Etude tutorials. There are a variety of learning opportunities available to faculty on flex days.

Students have several online resources to help them with learning the technologies they will need to use for their instruction. Further, support information for the current LMS (Etudes) and other related LMS/DE support questions that students and instructors may have.

Distance Education (fully online, hybrid, and PACE) Online courses could be improved by:

- Ensuring that every DE course is ADA compliant. Captions are highly recommended for implementation. The institution may need to augment the DE budget for this purpose.
- Creating of a minimum course syllabus that shows common elements and requirements for the college.
- Ensuring that an Introduction page is displayed for each online, hybrid, and PACE course offering.
- Ensuring and measuring regular and effective contact with students during online/hybrid courses, especially in PACE/hybrid courses.

There is an opportunity for deeper training opportunities in relationship to AB 2558 that specifically address Classified Staff training. As for students, a more robust training for the LMS should be offered,
including regular and effective contact as it relates to web enhanced, hybrid, and online learning, including but not limited to PACE and other like programs.

From the District Team

III.C. 1-5 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.

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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (III.C.5)

Conclusions

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. (III.C.1, III.C.4)

District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

1. **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. (III.C.3)

The college meets the standard by offering their faculty a variety of learning opportunities in technology and technology systems and by providing sufficient resources for teaching and learning processes as evidenced by the DE’s Distance Learning Manual.

Recommendations for Improvement:

1. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, Tech support services should be coordinated and strengthened to support instruction and campus support services. (IIIA.14, III.C.3, III.C.4)

III.D.: Financial Resources Planning

Findings and Evidence

The Resource Allocation Model is found at the end of every budget book. The allocation model seems to be based on a "block" fund plus FTES. Because of debt incurred in previous years, the College is required
to pay back that debt, in excess of $900,000 each year. During the two open forums on campus, it became evident this financial issue is on the minds of many LAHC employees. Additionally, the visiting team members received similar sentiments in meetings with various constituent groups. Specifically, the ongoing debt situation for the College has created issues with regard to morale and it is difficult to move forward with planning for College needs, improvement, and growth when it starts each year with these continuing major financial issues. Constituents fault the existing Resource Allocation Model for not addressing the debt that LAHC has accumulated to the District, and stated that five or six of the nine colleges are in the same situation.

From the District Team

Financial planning at the college is firmly aligned with the institution’s mission and goals. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner. The college meets this standard.

Conclusions: The College meets this standard.

Recommendations for Compliance: None

Recommendation for Improvement:

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, it is recommended that the College seek redress within the guidelines of the Resource Allocation Model, the internal process with the District Budget Committee, and through the internal district governance process (III.D.1).

From the District Team

III.D.1-16 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 which 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, EEU 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.

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.

**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. (III.D.1)

**Standard III.D.2: Financial Resources – Planning**

The institution’s mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner.
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. (III.D.3-4, 6)

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. (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. (III.D.5) (III.D.8)

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. (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. (III.D7) (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (III.D.12, 14) District audits reveal no locally incurred debt instruments. (III.D.13)

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. (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA City</td>
<td>25.35%</td>
<td>22.67%</td>
<td>26.44%</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East LA</td>
<td>24.53%</td>
<td>18.33%</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>14.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Harbor</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Mission</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Pierce</td>
<td>33.96%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Southwest</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Trade-Tech</td>
<td>36.66%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>38.54%</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Valley</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>12.63%</td>
<td>32.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West LA</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. (ER5) (III.D.10) (III.D.15)

**Standard III.D.16: Financial Resources – Contractual Agreements**

Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of its programs, services, and operations.

**Summary of Requirements** – the standard should answer the following questions:

- What contractual agreements exist, and are they consistent with institutional mission and goals?
- Does the institution have appropriate control over these contracts? Can it change or terminated contracts that don’t meet its required standards of quality?
- Are external contracts managed in a manner to ensure that federal guidelines are met?

Contractual Agreements: Arrangements for educational services that are either: (1) provided by the college/district/system for remuneration under contracts with business or other agencies, or (2) received by the college/district/system under contracts with businesses or other agencies. Contractual arrangements for delivery of education services may include, but are not limited to, curriculum, learning support services, student support services, and instruction.

**Review of Reports** – Following is a summary of the nine campus self-study reports:

- **Los Angeles City College** – The College has objectives to utilize contractual relationships to further its mission and achieve its goals. The college cites District Board procurement policies (including delegation of authority) and extensive District driven procurement procedures. No specific list of existing contracts, mention of termination provisions or federal guidelines compliance.

- **East Los Angeles College** – The College follows District procurement policies and procedures and requires all contracts to be submitted through the Office of Administrative Services and ultimately reviewed by the Administrative Vice President. The College identifies several types of contracts and gives a specific example of a contract that furthers the mission/goals of the institution. The College also lists the types of contractual provisions that are required for contract approval including risk, termination and quality control.

- **Los Angeles Harbor College** – The College’s procurement staff and management personnel review contracts to make sure they comply with statutory regulations and institutional policies and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the college and ensure quality. The Vice President then approves contracts before forwarding them to District for final approval if necessary.
• Los Angeles Mission College – The College VP of Administrative Services signs off on agreements, ensures consistency with mission and goals and ensures contracts contain appropriate provisions. No specific mention of termination provisions or federal guidelines compliance. Weak explanation of meeting the standard.

• Los Angeles Pierce College – The College complies with District procurement policies and procedures which are enforced by the District Educational Service Center (ECS). Contract provisions specifically mentioned include termination and compliance with state regulations. College President and Vice President of Administrative Services ensure adherence to mission and goals. Extensive District procedures and training are cited.

• Los Angeles Southwest College – The Vice President of Administrative Services reviews and signs off on all contracts and ensures consistency with the institution’s mission/goals. The College follows Board policies and District procedures and intends to hire a “purchasing aide” to assist in the process. The VP also ensures contracts contain the appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the College programs, services and operations. Weak explanation of meeting the standard.

• Los Angeles Trade – Technical College – The College employs a “technical reviewer” in Administrative Services to ensure the contract approval process which incorporates Board rules, District procedures and College processes are followed. Furthermore, the Vice President of Administrative Services ensures all contracts are consistent with the institution’s missions and goals and the contracts contain the appropriate provisions to maintain integrity of College programs, services and operations. Weak explanation of meeting the standard.

• Los Angeles Valley College – The College follows a tiered approach to contracting (low cost developed and approved locally, higher cost contracts through more elaborate District process), ensures necessary provisions are included to provide for termination and amendment to maintain control over the goods/services provided. Several specific contract examples cited to demonstrate consistency with mission/goals.

• West Los Angeles College – The College VP of Administrative Services ensures contracts are consistent with mission/goals of the College and follow the District policies and procedures. Further the VP ensures contracts maintain integrity of College programs and services. An internal audit procedure samples periodic agreements to further ensure compliance to policy and procedure. Weak explanation of meeting the standard.

**Assessment** – This standard will need to be answered by the College Team.

**Conclusions**

The team commends the District for its substantial support of the internal audit function. With the exception of Standard III.D.7 and III.D.12, the District meets the Standards.

**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. (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. (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. (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. (III.D.12)
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance: A, Decision-Making Roles and Processes and B, Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

In general, the Self-evaluation report contains broad statements about the College’s fulfillment of this particular standard. Details were sought through extensive interviews conducted during the visit. The ALO, faculty, staff, students, and managers were very cooperative and allowed for the collection of verbal evidence through interviews to corroborate the Evaluation Report.

The College demonstrates a collegial environment, one that provides ample opportunity for faculty, staff, and student input through its various committees. Shared decision-making is encouraged. Roles and responsibilities for Board Members and the various constituencies allow for the smooth flow in the decision-making process.

Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General observations

Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to insure effective planning and implementation.

Findings and Evidence

The College President has established a culture of community, collegiality, and innovation, in spite of the turnover in personnel at the cabinet level and in the management ranks. The College operates within a well-defined and long-established participatory governance environment with the full support of the college president and the administrative leadership team. The College Planning Council (CPC), comprised of representatives from classified, faculty, administrators, and students, meets twice a month as the primary college governance body. Interviews with the senate leadership, numerous faculty members, various administrators, the College president, student leaders, classified staff leaders, as well as the entire CPC, confirmed the inclusive and collaborative nature of the college (IV.A.1.).

The team noted the leadership among the longstanding faculty, staff, and administrators who are dedicated to serving the community and their strong commitment to the institution in spite of the recent dearth in administrative constancy. The team was impressed with the consistent student representation on all governance committees and the extensive knowledge and engagement of the senators as well as the leadership skills of the student association president and vice president (IV.A.1).

With President Lee’s encouragement, individuals are taking the initiative to improve institutional practices, programs, and services. The team learned that the institutional focus over the past year has been the improvement of the planning and resource allocation process. Discussions in this body led to the adoption of the Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS), which incorporated unit-level
assessment into college-wide planning. The new process allows college-level issues and ideas to emerge from unit-level planning. For example, innovations such as Life Skills Center, Turnitin.com, and the STEM Grant emerged as a result of the assessment process (IV.A.1).

The Self Evaluation Report asserts that “Decision-making at Harbor College encourages creativity and is also methodical and inclusive.” After numerous interviews, a review of planning documents, classroom visits, observations in college governance meetings, participation in the visiting team welcome activities, and two campus forums, the team recognizes extensive leadership in practice throughout the organization. Visiting team members noted that, under President Lee’s leadership, the college constituency representatives engage in the participatory governance process to discuss, implement and support institutional efforts to move the institution forward toward institutional excellence. (IV.A.2)

A review of the College’s Participatory Governance Agreement shows that individuals may introduce ideas into the shared governance process for further development. As stated in the College Evaluation Report, Article IV Section 3 of the Agreement clarifies the students’ role on shared governance committees and delineates the areas of student influence in the governance process. Student attendance is affirmed by long-standing Association of Students (ASO) procedures that specifically assign student leaders to governance and planning committees, and student participation is documented on the standardized template for committee participants (IV.A.1).

Through their participation in governance bodies, LAHC students exercise a voice in college planning and initiatives. For example, student input was elicited when the College considered offering winter or summer sessions, and when a new student center was being considered. Students are represented by the President of the Associated Students Organization on the President’s Cabinet, and by a Student Trustee on the LACCD Board of Trustees (IV.A.2). CEO, includes the ASO President to ensure that student are always informed on College issues (IV.A.1).

The team affirmed that the College relies on its faculty for recommendations on academic matters, including student learning, programs, and support services (IV.A.2). The team confirmed that the College has various effective governance structures that demonstrate collaboration, effective decision-making, and allow for ample opportunities to communicate actions widely and to all constituencies (IV.A.3, IV.A.5). For example, the College Planning Council’s review of college planning processes led it to convene a planning task force, which worked throughout summer 2015 to develop a revised planning process.

The team confirmed that the roles of administration and faculty in governance are clearly delineated in board policy. Additionally, the team reviewed the Collective Bargaining Agreement which requires faculty representation on participative governance committees. In addition, the faculty evaluation process calls for faculty to be evaluated based on their participation in college governance (IV.A.3).

The Participatory Governance Agreement and Planning Policy and Procedure Manual also describe the roles of each constituency group in planning and budget development. As mentioned in the Self Evaluation, the roles of all constituencies in the planning and budget processes are clearly codified. The team confirmed that the faculty have primacy in academic matters. The revised planning model incorporates assessment work into unit planning and aligns with the goals described in the SEMP. Consequently, faculty priorities are considered in the college process and often are moved forward as
institutional priorities. For example, the Kinesiology faculty prioritized the hiring of a Women’s Cross country coach in their unit plan and this request was supported by all constituency groups and the recommendation to hire was ultimately approved (IV.A.3).

The team review of policies and interviews with college faculty show the principal role of the academic senate in college governance matters concerning curriculum, and student learning. At Harbor, faculty are primarily responsible for curricular recommendations, student learning programs and support services. The Curriculum Committee, the Student Success Coordinating Committee, and the Assessment Committee all report periodically to the Academic Senate and the College Planning Council and are responsible for the review and oversight of curriculum (IV.A.4).

The team confirmed that appropriate faculty are primarily responsible for curricular development, updates and additions. The faculty-driven curriculum process is supported by a dean. The team confirmed that the faculty Curriculum Committee Chair and the faculty Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator, are provided release time for their work. The team affirmed that the Director of the Library and Learning Resource Center oversees academic support services and that the Vice-President of Student Services oversees the assessment of service area programs. These leaders, working collaboratively with faculty, make recommendations to the Senate and CPC and, based upon their approval, implement curricular and programmatic change as appropriate. (IV.A.4).

Through observation, review of the college shared governance agreement, and interviews with key constituency group representatives, the team confirmed that a viable and inclusive institutional governance environment exists at Harbor College. With most administrative positions currently filled, the college administration demonstrates appropriate capacity in the executive level positions. College plans to promptly finalize searches for the permanent vice president position in Academic Affairs and Student Services demonstrate a commitment to further strengthen leadership capacity and will provide added stability to the organization.

The coordination of Equity, SSSP, and other initiatives through the Student Success Coordinating Committee assures appropriate coordination and responsibility by individuals with relevant expertise. In addition, the team observed that the College Planning Council includes representation from the major constituencies—faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Numerous sub-committees of the Academic Senate include representatives from each academic division. The Bond Steering Committee, CPC, SSCC, and other committees have shared leadership responsibilities and structure, further ensuring the appropriate representation of the three major staff constituencies. Beyond the formal institutional governance committees, the CEO meets regularly with classified staff representatives to discuss issues and their resolution (IV.A.5.).

The team conducted interviews, reviewed the College Planning Policy and Procedure Manual, and reviewed numerous sites to retrieve minutes, agendas and other sources of evidence to confirm that the college appropriately documents the decision-making process and the outcome of decisions. The team noted that the diagram illustrating the revised planning process has been shared widely and is understood by the college community. The campus leadership and constituency group representatives use email to communicate decisions and share meeting minutes. The College also uses SharePoint software to ensure
wider access to manuals, processes, agendas, and minutes. The CEO provides presidential updates throughout the year that include recent decisions and offer important information. (IV.A.6.).

While many agendas and minutes are easily accessible and complete, some committee agendas and minutes are not updated regularly or are not readily available to the college staff and public. Interviews with faculty, staff, and students documented ongoing institutional efforts to improve communication. The team anticipates that the ongoing college commitment and effort to formalize college-wide communication will further ensure that all college processes and decisions will be disseminated effectively in the future (IV.A.6).

The Self Evaluation Report states, “The College’s evaluation of its governance and decision-making policies, procedures and processes occurs with committee evaluations and the periodic review of its manuals and shared governance documents. The team conducted a review of college planning documents, interviews with individuals, including the senate president, classified staff members, faculty, CPC, the college researcher, the vice president of administration, and others, to determine level of institutional commitment and practices to evaluate the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes. The team found that the Senate’s Academic Policies and Procedures and the Academic Senate Constitution were reviewed and updated. While the team did not find evidence of continuous evaluation of all governance and decision-making processes during a review of the agendas and minutes from CPC, interviews with constituency group leaders, dialogue in team members’ meeting with CPC, and comments at the campus forums, there is some evidence of initial committee self-evaluations, the periodic review of senate manuals and updates of shared governance documents (IV.A.7)

In 2014, the CPC planning retreat resulted in a Planning Task Force that suggested revisions to the planning process. Work has also been done to align Harbor College goals with the LACCD goals and the Harbor College Mission. More recently, the college has developed and implemented an integrated planning model that considers student data and outcome measures informed by the program review and unit plans.

Conclusions

The College President, vice presidents, and deans promote a college culture that encourages participation and open dialogue. Interviews with college leaders, the college president, classified staff and faculty, show that the president has broadened participation at his cabinet meeting to include all constituency groups, including students. Strong participation in the CPC meetings illustrates college-wide participation and a voice for all council members and interested staff, faculty, and managers. The College practices effective planning and appropriately implements ideas for institutional improvement.

In short, the team found that the CPC effectively fulfills its decision-making responsibilities through the established policies and practices. Faculty, staff, students, and managers participate in decision-making processes at the College as appropriate and as outlined in college documents.

The team confirmed that the roles of administration and faculty in governance are clearly delineated in board policy. The team also found that administrators and faculty are fully engaged in participatory governance and have a strong voice in developing and implementing institutional policies, planning, and budget.
It is evident that College faculty and academic administrators have primary responsibility regarding matters of curriculum and student learning at Harbor College.

The College ensures that all shared governance committees include representatives from a variety of constituencies that provide diverse and relevant perspectives in the decision-making process. Responsibilities are aligned with experts to accomplish effective planning, policies, and relevant curriculum. While anecdotal comments indicate a perception that the process is working well, it is unclear to the team if there is a current plan or policy that requires regular evaluation of the processes to ensure integrity and effectiveness.

While the team verified that planning processes have been changed through a collaborative process and anecdotal comments indicate a perception that the process is working well, the College should, with the goal of improving the standard, develop and implement a plan for systematic evaluation of leadership roles, the college governance process and decision-making policies, procedures and processes. (IV.A.7)

From the District Team

IV.A.3-5 Governance

General Observations

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.

Findings and Evidence

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. (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. (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. (IV.A.5)

Conclusion

LACCD meets Standards IV.A.3, IV.A.4, and IV.A.5.

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. (IV.A.5.)

The College meets this Standard.

**Recommendation for Compliance:** None

**Recommendations for Improvement:** None

---

**Standard IV.B. Chief Executive Officer**

**Findings and Evidence**

President Lee was appointed by the LACCD Board as (CEO) of Los Angeles Harbor College in June 2014. The team recognizes that President Lee promptly assumed full responsibility for overseeing the institution and all the duties outlined in his job description. Under President Lee’s leadership the college has engaged in a concerted effort to improve the integrated and ongoing planning and resource allocation process as outlined in an updated version of the College Planning Policy and Procedures Manual. Under his direction, the College has undertaken the alignment of major college and district plans, the college budget is regularly reviewed, and the communication with campus leadership regarding College and District priorities has improved. For example, the President meets monthly with the Academic Senate President and union representatives to discuss budgetary and contractual matters. The CEO has provided leadership to strengthen the College’s use of student success data as the foundation for unit planning and resource allocation. These efforts have resulted in broader dissemination of information and improved ongoing dialogue among constituencies, articulated the importance of the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP), and encouraged alignment with the LACCD strategic goals and district planning process. President Lee’s support of the Achieving the Dream Initiative and Equity Plan have helped the College address disproportionately impacted students by developing and implementing effective programs to serve all students.

With a full team of executive leaders on board, the CEO provides leadership and direction in all college matters. The CEO regularly directs and supports senior leadership to address planning, budgeting, personnel, and in assessing institutional effectiveness.

President Lee is responsible for college personnel decisions. According to the Evaluation Report, the President has ultimate responsibility for hiring decisions, however, he relies on the recommendations of the College Planning Council and the Academic Senate to determine hiring priorities. The CEO encourages professional growth among managers by assigning them to interim positions as appropriate, and among classified staff by supporting professional development opportunities.

The team affirmed that he works collaboratively within the shared governance process, College and District policies. The team found, through interviews and review of policies, that these decisions are
based upon recommendations provided by the participatory governance committees as permitted by budget. (IV.B.1)

President Lee has positioned executive leaders in key positions to ensure leadership in academic affairs, finance and administration, and student services. Although the number of administrators on the College staff is determined by the LACCD Allocation Model, policy is appropriately implemented by the CEO. At Harbor, there are three vice presidents: 1) Academic Affairs; 2) Student Support; and 3) Administrative Services. In addition, campus leadership is provided by ten deans. The President has promptly filled positions in an administrative structure that is organized to best serve the institution. Although two of the three vice presidents are in interim roles, their presence, expertise, and growing experience are serving the college well. The team confirmed that under President Lee’s leadership, deans, faculty and classified staff who have been with the college during repeated leadership transitions, continue to be supported and encouraged to provide vital leadership throughout the organization. Interviews with faculty leadership and classified staff leadership affirmed the critical role of division chairs and experienced college deans in providing continuous student-centered leadership for the institution in service to the community. (IV.B.2)

President Lee has engaged the college in numerous initiatives and broad efforts that will lead the college toward institutional improvement and improvements to the teaching learning process. A review of college planning documents and examples provided by the college show the purposeful use of governance, planning, and budget allocation process to hire faculty, promote and implement emergency preparedness, and institute an improved college planning model. Through a collegial process, the CEO encourages a data-driven process that aligns actions with the college mission.

College constituency group reports, interviews, a review of minutes from numerous committee meetings show that the CEO communicates regularly with the college community to set values, goals, and priorities. His presence at events and meetings such as Opening Day, graduation ceremonies, award ceremonies, town hall meetings, CPC meetings, Senate, Harbor Success Days, President’s Cabinet, Accreditation Steering Committee meetings, and occasional Chancellor visits to Harbor College illustrate his efforts to communicate college priorities.

While the CEO hired a dean of institutional effectiveness and a research analyst, there appear to be some gaps in college-wide understanding and use of data for assessment and improving student learning. In interviews with the dean of Institutional Effectiveness, it became clear that the college has set institutional minimum standards for student achievement as well as institution set goals. The CEO and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness facilitated the establishment of these college standards, data collection, and analysis to assess student achievement. The team learned that the institution set minimum standards to use as minimum student performance targets in program review. Interviews with the dean of institutional effectiveness informed the team that the college has not set clear goals for creating improvement plans through the unit planning process. According to the dean of institutional effectiveness in interviews with multiple visiting team members, only minimum set standards were established by the college and are the only measure now used to assess student performance in unit plans and program review. During further discussion with team members, the dean of institutional effectiveness asserted that the college has not undertaken any assessment of student achievement standards and that this was not appropriate or required.
Discussion with CPC members clearly showed the existence of college set goals above the minimum set standards that are used in unit planning, and this discussion with CPC demonstrated that substantial dialogue had taken place to establish both college minimum standards and college goals. It appears that the college has appropriate student achievement standards in place.

Interviews and a review of college documents show that the CEO supports the use of data in decision-making, participatory governance committees, college planning, and measuring alignment with the college mission and in aligning with the LACCD strategic goals.

President Lee’s support of the Achieving the Dream initiative and strengthening the First Year Experience and Harbor Advantage program illustrates his commitment to linking research, data analysis, and student achievement. The President facilitated the process of reviewing the college mission statement. As appropriate, this included a review of the College values and priorities and was vetted with all constituency groups through the college participatory governance process. The visiting team confirmed that the CEO participates in self-assessment as part of the approved annual evaluation process conducted by the District Chancellor. (IV.B.3)

The CEO has fully supported the development of the self-evaluation report as a means to institutional improvement and integration of the accreditation standards into the college culture. The team recognizes that the College has undertaken the self evaluation in a very short time frame, following a 2015 Midterm Report. The team found that the self evaluation process is broadly shared among governance committees and individuals in the organization. The CEO promoted third party comment on the self evaluation by inviting community to comment. (IV.B.4)

The CEO ensures the college adheres to all statutes, regulations and governing board policies. Interviews with constituency group representatives demonstrate the CEO is committed to following all appropriate statutes, regulations, and governing board policies. Through his oversight, appointments, and direction to his executive leadership team, the college upholds the mission and appropriately manages the college budgeting process. Discussion with the vice president of administrative services highlighted the effectiveness of the resources allocation process and appropriate controls at the College. Recent work by the college to implement efficient enrollment management practices may facilitate further examination of expenditures and improve efficiency in the instructional schedule and college operations. (IV.B.5)

Team member interviews with the CEO, President’s cabinet, statements in the Self Evaluation Report, and a review of numerous college documents affirmed that the CEO collaborates to serve the communities in the service area. The president (or his designee) communicates often with business, industry, community organizations, public agencies, and educational institutions. He helps develop and supports college programs that meet community interests. Written documentation and conversations with college community, including the president, show the CEO has established constructive affiliations with numerous local entities. As an example, his partnerships with local high school districts, the Port of Los Angeles, AltaSea (a world class marine research and innovation center at the Port of Los Angeles), and CSU Dominguez Hills will transform the vision for the Port of Los Angeles, establish new training and educational opportunities while creating high demand-high wage jobs for local residents. This partnership will support a new innovative college program in global trade and advanced logistics. Other examples of regional collaborations include partnerships with the Port of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County
Sheriff’s department, the Los Angeles USD, and numerous CTE and program advisory boards. In addition, the president has initiated a plan to build up the college foundation. (IV.B.6)

**Conclusions:** The College meets this Standard.

President Lee has focused institutional direction and resources on improving assessment of institutional effectiveness. He provides leadership and support to College Institutional Effectiveness efforts. Based on his initiative, data and planning is moving toward full alignment with LACCD’s Strategic Plan and District priorities.

President Lee has facilitated the placement of all upper management positions appropriately and has delegated authority based on the expertise of those in administrative positions. The vice presidents serve the institution well and work collaboratively to help meet the institution’s mission.

The college president adheres to established policies and procedures in fulfilling the college mission. He has guided the institution to seek institutional improvement and improve the teaching and learning culture of the organization through a collaborative and visionary process. The team found that he has nurtured a collegial process and has moved the college toward ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource allocation in support of learning and student achievement.

The CEO assumes responsibility for the college’s accreditation and advocates for full compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

The CEO is knowledgeable about policies and mandates and implements appropriate controls on budget and expenditures.

It is clear that the CEO understands the community served by the college and that he has effectively established communications and positive associations that have created strong ties to the community.

**IV.C.1-13 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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (IV.C.13)

**Conclusions**

The District meets Standard IV.C., except IV.C.3 and IV.C.7.
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. (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. (IV.C.7)

From the District Team

**Standard IV.D.3**

The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures.

**General Observations**

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.

In 2011 the District had started 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 development and approved an allocation model that is defined and seems to be understood.

In May 2013, ACCJC sent a team to follow up on the allocation model recommendation. The team found that the District had exerted great effort and devoted a considerable amount of resources to address the recommendation. The team commended the District and Colleges for their effort exerted but also for the transparent and collaborative process which was used to the institution forward. The team concluded that the District met the requirements of this recommendation.

As of the end of the 2015-16 year, there were five colleges that have debt owed back to the District for prior-year over expenditures that will need to be handled. (IV.D.3)

**Finding and Evidence**

Standard IV.D.- The District approved Phase I of the District’s new allocation model on June 13, 2012 which focused on the annual allocation of resources. Phase II was worked on during the months of April and May 2013 which covered the review of college carryover funds, reserve balances, college growth
formula and college debts, and operating deficits. These changes were all reviewed and discussed at the District Budget Committee and approved by the Board of Trustees.

The allocation model starts with an annual base allocation to fully fund minimum administrative staffing for the President, Vice Presidents, an Institutional Research Dean, a Facilities Manager and a number of Deans (based on size of the College) and Maintenance and Operations costs based on average cost per gross square footage. After allocating the minimum base allocation, all remaining revenue (with a few exceptions) are distributed to Colleges based on their proportion of the District’s funded FTES. There was a provision for transition funding in the event that a College suffered a reduction in funding due to the new model. There are also provisions in the model to charge for such things as, Central Accounts, Educational Services Center functions, and appropriate reserve levels at both the District and Colleges.

The Colleges can keep their year-end balances up to 5% of their prior year Unrestricted General Fund budget excluding the prior years’ carryover funds. There is also details in the model on how Colleges with prior year over expenditures will pay off the debt. The model was included in the 2014-15 Final Budget of the District as Appendix F and the implementation can be tracked in the 2015-16 Final Budget.

The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditure. The District's website has detailed monthly expenditure reports for the District as well as the College to assist with tracking, monitoring, and maintaining budgets, commitments, and expenditures. The Colleges and District financial reports are reviewed by staff and are submitted to the Board of Trustees.

**Conclusions:** The District meets this Standard.

**Recommendations for Compliance:** None

**Recommendations for Improvement:** None
From the District Team

IV.D.1-7 Multi-college districts

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. (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. (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. (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. (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.” (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. (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. (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). (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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. (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 (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. (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. (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. (IV.D.7)

**Conclusions**

The District meets the requirements outlined in 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 and Compliance**

- **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. (IV.D.6.)
Quality Focus Essay

The college’s commitment to strengthen its achievement of the standards is reflected in the Quality Focus Essay (QFE), where three action projects were identified:

1. Infuse “Systems” principles into the assessment and planning processes
2. Strengthen Collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services
3. Formalize College wide communication

In particular, Project #1, infusing “systems” principles into the assessment and planning processes, addresses components of the visiting team’s recommendations for improvement.

The college acknowledged that policies, procedures, manuals, and publications likely are in need of review and revision, and, therefore, have included a comprehensive review process as a part of its Quality Focus Essay under “Formalize College communications.” It is recommended that the Quality Focus Essay might be implemented by 1) completing a comprehensive review of its policies, procedures, manuals and publications to ensure accuracy, legal compliance, and best practices for communication and process documentation; and 2) identifying responsible parties to keep these documents up to date.

**Documents Reviewed**

- SEMP Fact Book 2014
- Distance Education Committee
- Harbor Online
- 2014 Faculty Handbook
- Course SLO Assessment Website
- 2015-16 SLO-SA0 Assessment
- Professional Development Committee Webpage
- Teaching Learning Center Webpage
- Planning Process Documents
- PACE (Plan for Accelerated College Education)
- Alpha Gamma Sigma and Honors Transfer Program
- Harbor Advantage (a first-year experience program)
- Harbor Advantage, CHAMPS, and First-time Student Comparison
- Harbor Advantage Progression (Fall 2014)
- STEM (Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics) advisement program
CHAMPS Program (Challenging Athletes’ Minds for Personal Success)

CHAMPS Profile (Fall 2015)

CHAMPS Student Outcomes (Spring 2015)

Music Department Student-Teacher-Academic-Rescue-Squad (STARS) Program

Culturally Responsive Training Website and training guide

LAHC General Catalog, 2014-16

Class Schedule, Winter 2016

SSSP Unit Plan 2015-16

Student Services outcomes assessments for all units

HAPS documents for non-instructional (service) programs.

Examples of student services research reports

Agendas and minutes, SSSP, Student Success, Student Equity Committees, showing dialogue about student success initiatives

Strategic Educ. Master Plan

CDC Unit Plan

Self Evaluation Report

Article I—Academic Senate and Board of Trustees Shared Governance Policy

Board of Trustee Shared Governance Policy

Chancellor's Directive No 70

AFT/LACCD Collective Bargaining Agreement

Planning Policy and Procedure Manual

Planning Evaluation Report 2012-2013

Strategic Educational Master Plan 2014-2017

College Planning Council minutes showing dialogue regarding the planning process


Advisory Webpage

Harbor Teacher Preparation Academy

Harbor College Foundation

Planning Policy & Procedures Manual

2014-17 Strategic Educational Master Plan

Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC)
Human Resource Committee
LACCD Administrators Contract
AFT1521 2014-17_WebContract
Examples of recommendations from Curriculum Committee to CPC
Examples of recommendations of Student Success Coordinating Committee to CPC
Self Evaluation Report
Examples of recommendations from Assessment Committee to CPC
Examples of recommendations of Student Success Coordinating Committee to CPC
List of committees and their membership
Planning Task force meeting notes
Planning Task Force membership list
Planning Task Force presentations to constituencies
Senate agendas, email invitations, and minutes
CPC agendas and meeting minutes
President’s Cabinet agendas and minutes
Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with
Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards; there may be other evaluation items under ACCJC standards which address the same or similar subject matter. Evaluation teams will evaluate the institution’s compliance with standards as well as the specific Checklist elements from federal regulations and related Commission policies noted here.

General Instructions: The form should contain narrative as well as the “check-off.”

a. The team should place a check mark next to each evaluation item when it has been evaluated.

b. For each subject category (e.g., “Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment”), the team should also complete the conclusion check-off.

c. The narrative will cite to the evidence reviewed and team findings related to each of the evaluation items. If some content is discussed in detail elsewhere in the team report, the page(s) of the team report can be cited instead of repeating that portion of the narrative.

d. Any areas of deficiency from the Checklist leading to noncompliance, or areas needing improvement, should be included in the evaluation conclusions section of the team report along with any recommendations.

This Checklist will become part of the evaluation team report. Institutions may also use this form as a guide for preparing documentation for team review. It is found as an appendix in the team and institutional self evaluation manuals.

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

_x___ The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit. Had community forum IVA

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

_x___ The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party Comment. Posted self-study on website, scheduled fora
[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

___x___ 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 (add space as needed):

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

___x___ 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. Look at unit plan 2.0 delineates all components of student achievement and in Strategic Educational Master Plan

The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within

___x___ 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. Unit Plan 2.0x

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, ___x___ 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).]

___x___

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.

___x___ 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 (add space as needed): they have set the minimum standards but have not assessed or closed the loop. It is recommended that the college continue the data collection through implementation through unit 2.0 planning and provide results in the next interim report.

**Credits, Program Length, and Tuition**

**Evaluation Items:**

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

__x___ 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).

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

__x___ 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):**

__x___ 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 (add space as needed):

**Transfer Policies**

**Evaluation Items:**

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

___x___ Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.

___x___ 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):**

___x___ 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 (add space as needed):

Transfer of credit policies are clearly stated in the catalog. Articulation agreements with public and private institutions are widely available.

**Distance Education and Correspondence Education**

**Evaluation Items:**
__x__ 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.

__x__ 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).

__x__ 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. Need unique user name and login

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

__x__ The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education. Uneven with regard to student participation requirements

[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.

__x__ 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 (add space as needed):**

Distance Ed, hybrid and PACE programs need to follow up on student participation requirements.
Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

___x___ 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.

__x__ 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.

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

___x___ 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.

___x___ 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):

___x___ 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 (add space as needed):
District form for Title IX complaints on website. Complaint process outlined in catalog pages 10-11. Policies available in hard copy but not online. Accreditation info and Title IX available on website

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

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

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

__x__ 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):

__x__ 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 (add space as needed):**

The Institution communicates effectively with the student body and community through written materials, the website, blogs, facebook and twitter. The general catalog is printed every two years with the online version updated when changes are needed. Accreditation status is printed in the catalog and available on the website.

**Title IV Compliance**

**Evaluation Items:**

___X___ 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.

___X___ Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, 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 and _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.]

___X___
Conclusion Check-Off:

_____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

___x___ 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 (add space as needed):
The Team met prior to the Exit Meeting, and this checklist was reviewed as a group activity. The Team notes the following:

Los Angeles Harbor College is discontinuing Perkins loans because the default rate was above 30% but it does have an action plan in place to remedy the situation, and approved by the USDE.

The Institution contracts tutoring services that meet the appropriate standards. A needs assessment should be done to determine the needs of the tutoring program. While tutoring is available online, there appears to be minimal feedback regarding the efficiency of the program.

Contractual agreements regarding Dual enrollment are appropriate and the program is a model for the state.