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TEAM REPORT: Comprehensive Evaluation Report

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

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

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

1. The Commission finds that the College meets Eligibility Requirement 15 and removes that citation from College Recommendation 2.
2. The Commission notes that references to a business continuity and/or disaster recovery plan should not be capitalized as in District Recommendation 4. The team’s reference is to a general plan and not a specific plan with that title.
3. The Commission finds that the College addressed Recommendation 4, resolved the deficiency and meets Standard I.C.2 and ER 20 prior to the Commission meeting by including the Academic Calendar in the College Catalog.
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Summary of Evaluation Report

Institution: Mission Valley College
Date of Visit: March 6 – 10, 2016
Team Chair: Deborah J. Ikeda
          President, Clovis Community College

A twelve-member accreditation team visited Los Angeles Mission College from March 6-10, 2016, for the purposes of determining the extent to which the college meets the standards set forth by the accrediting commission. Los Angeles Mission College, located on 33 acres in the community of Sylmar, close to the city of San Fernando in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. Los Angeles Mission College is one of nine Los Angeles District Community Colleges serving the greater Los Angeles area.

In preparation for the team visit, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on December 2, 2015 and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on January 13, 2016. During this pre-visit, the chair and team assistant met with the campus leadership and key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation and process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by ACCJC staff on Wednesday, January 27, 2016.

Once the team received the Self Evaluation Report, the team read it thoroughly, reviewed the catalog, and other supporting documents provided on a flash drive as evidence and also checked the college website. Each member was asked to write a preliminary review of the Standard to which he or she was assigned. Part of the team formed part of the District team and met at a downtown Los Angeles hotel with other District team members, College team chairs, and College team members to discuss coordination for District narrative and findings. The entire college team met at a local hotel near the college on Sunday afternoon to review evaluations of the Self Evaluation Report and to organize the site visit which began on Monday. Several team members attended the standing Educational Planning Committee meeting Monday afternoon on campus while District team members interviewed District staff and Trustees at the District Office on Monday morning. The entire team reconvened at the Team Hotel Monday afternoon to organize for the remainder of the visit to LA Mission College.

For the remaining two and a half days, the team held on-campus meetings with individuals and groups, conducted interviews of administrators, faculty, support staff, and students, examined files, reports and documents, which included documents and evidence supporting the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations, observed classes and facilities, attended on-campus meetings, campus-wide meetings, met a great number of individuals at LA Mission College, and met with district-wide personnel—including board members. Other evidence viewed included documents such as institution plans, program review procedures and reports, student learning outcomes evidence, distance education classes, College policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and the College's governance structure. In addition, two open sessions were held to allow the college and
community members and opportunity to speak to members of the team. During the above time period, the team collectively met either individually or in groups with over 200 college faculty, classified staff, students, administrators, community members and governing board members.

The team greatly appreciated the hospitality, enthusiasm, and support from College employees throughout the entire visit. The team appreciated the assistance of key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and other requests through the evaluation process. Every request was met with enthusiasm and quickly.

The team found Los Angeles Mission College to be in compliance with most of the Commissions Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and Policies. The team found a number of innovative and effective programs and issued a number of commendations to the College. The team made several recommendations to improve institutional effectiveness and a few that will require the College to meet Standards.

**District Team Organization and Responsibilities**

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

**District Team Lead Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER or Standard</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ER 5</td>
<td>Financial accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.7</td>
<td>Policies on academic freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.8</td>
<td>Policies that promote honesty, academic integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.6</td>
<td>Admissions policies</td>
<td>As to District admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.8</td>
<td>Student records</td>
<td>As to District policy and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1-6, 8, 11-13, 15</td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>As to policies and District procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.1-4</td>
<td>Physical resources</td>
<td>As to District planning, bond oversight, total cost of ownership formulas, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C. 1-5</td>
<td>Technology resources</td>
<td>As to District planning, policy, practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### District Team Support Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER or Standard</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ER 4</td>
<td>Chief executive officer</td>
<td>As to appointment of CEO by governing board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A. 4</td>
<td>Mission approved, articulated and reviewed</td>
<td>As to approval of the mission statement by the Governing Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.9</td>
<td>Planning addresses resource needs</td>
<td>As to District tie-in on integrated planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.12</td>
<td>Integrity with ACCJC</td>
<td>As to District Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.13</td>
<td>Integrity with external agencies, legal compliance</td>
<td>As to District Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.14</td>
<td>Commitment to quality paramount over supporting external interests</td>
<td>As to District Office, governing board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.4</td>
<td>Course outlines of record have SLOs</td>
<td>As to District Office involvement in curriculum approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.10</td>
<td>Transfer policies, articulation agreements</td>
<td>As to District transfer policies and articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.B.4</td>
<td>Library and learning resources</td>
<td>As to District role, especially databases, contracted services, technology, resource allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.7</td>
<td>Placement exams</td>
<td>As to District approval of exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.A.1</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>As to District Office, possibly policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2016 External Evaluation Team (College and District)

Team Commendations
During the visit, the team recognized several aspects of the College worthy of commendations.

Commendation 1
The team commends the College for its collegial spirit. It is evident that the enthusiasm and commitment to the success of its students radiates through all endeavors, actions, and activities. It’s clear that the College has made an effort to incorporate a collegial relationship among all employees, the students, and the community it serves.

Commendation 2
The team commends the College for the clarity of the Office of Institutional Research web page, which is easy to navigate and provides access to relevant and important information related to institutional planning and evaluation, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

Commendation 3
The team commends Los Angeles Mission College for its continued in-depth work with instructional area learning outcomes assessment that has led to collegial discussions on data and results that truly impact hiring and pedagogical decisions.

Commendation 4
The team commends the College and District for its professional development initiatives. There is a clear commitment to training new and ongoing faculty at the college-level and effective succession planning at the district-level.

Commendation 5
The team commends the College for designing and constructing an exceptional, new, award-winning Platinum LEED facilities that support student learning with state of the art technology, student success, and community alliances.

Commendation 6
The team commends the college on maintaining a safe, secure, and well maintained facility at both campus locations. The facilities and maintenance staff takes great pride in the beautiful campus physical plant that supports a quality learning environment for the students and a quality working environment for the staff.

Commendation 7
The team commends the College for its diligence in meeting state and federal requirements for Distance Education, including processes for course approval and student authentication, and a policy for Regular, Substantive Contact.
Commendation 8
The team would like to commend the College on its well thought-out and collegial process for program review, prioritization of resource requests, and allocation of resources.

Team Recommendations
As a result of the external evaluation, the team makes the following recommendations.

Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

Recommendation 1 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College simplify the planning documentation and procedures as delineated in the Quality Focus Essay. I.A.2, I.B.9, III.D.2, ER 19

Recommendation 2 (Compliance)
In order to meet the Standards and as noted by the College in its Quality Focus Essay, the Team recommends that the College provide appropriate, reliable, and equitable support services to all students. In addition, the Team recommends training staff to improve the design and assessment of service area outcomes to continuously improve student support programs and services. (I.B.4, II.C.1, II.C.2, II.C.3, II.C.5, ER 15)

Recommendation 3 (Compliance)
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a plan to evaluate all learning and tutoring center services and support to students, regardless of location or means of delivery, and use the result of the evaluation as a basis for improvement. (II.B3)

Recommendation 4 (Compliance)
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College add an academic calendar to the catalog. (I.C.2, ER 20)

Recommendation 5 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a process for reviewing instructional department websites to ensure that information on those sites is clear, accurate, and consistent with College policies and procedures. (I.C.1)

Recommendation 6 (Compliance)
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College update academic administrators’ and part-time faculty performance evaluations to include the responsibility of these individuals in learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. (III.A.6)

Recommendation 7 (Improvement)
In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that Los Angeles Mission College follow through on its Actionable Improvement Plan to better assess the technology-related needs of the college by collecting data from users and analyzing the data to inform the revision of the Technology Master Plan and the Technology Replacement Plan. (Standards III.C.1)
LACCD Commendations and Recommendations

District Commendations

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

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

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

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

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

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

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)
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)

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)

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)

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

1. Authority

The team confirmed that Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) is authorized to operate as a post-secondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and granted authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. The authority is noted on the third page of the college catalog and on the Accreditation website. The most recent accreditation reaffirmation occurred in 2013.

The College meets the ER.

2. Operational Status

Mission College is currently operational and has been since 1975. The college offers CTE, transfer and basic skills courses, with programs to transfer to institutions of higher education and transition into the workforce.

The College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

3. Degrees

Los Angeles Mission College offers 64 associate degree programs, 13 transfer degrees and 43 certificates, with courses in 74 disciplines. The majority of the college’s courses are degree applicable; those that are not provide opportunities in basic skills education. Forty nine percent of students officially state that their goal is to transfer to a four-year college or university.

The College meets this Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The evaluation confirmed that the President serves as the chief administrator for LA Mission College and is delegated all the authority necessary by the Chancellor to administer the college. The evaluation team confirmed that the Chancellor serves as Los Angeles Community College District’s chief administrator. The Chancellor was appointed by the Board of Trustees in 2014 in accordance with Board Policy. The Chancellor’s duties are clearly defined in Board Policy, (BR 2300.10, Chapter II - Article III). Delegation of authority is to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institutions.

The College and District meet the 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.
CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATING COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND RELATED COMMISSION POLICIES

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.
___X___ The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
___X___ The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party comment. [Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):
___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:

Los Angeles Mission College notified the campus community and the public of the accreditation visit and provided constituent groups information for submitting third party comment. The notification was provided through links and posted materials on the College website, via meetings, and through presentations by LAMC’s chief executive officer.

Los Angeles Mission College coordinated its internal accreditation activities through the College Accreditation Steering Committee. The committee membership was broad-based and included all College constituents. The Self Evaluation report was sent to the entire campus community and a summary of the report was presented at LAMC’s Academic Senate and College Council where third party comments were solicited. The College was responsive to the evaluation team regarding follow-up questions.

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.

___X___ The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each
instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.

_**X**_ The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.

_**X**_ The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

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

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

_**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:**

The College has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution and has set performance expectations for each element as evidenced by Institution-Set Standards Data 2014 and LAMC Institution-Set Standards Data 2015. These standards include course completion as well as other elements of student achievement. The College has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program and has identified expected measure of performance. Job placement rates were discussed in the Council of Instruction, March 4, 2015. The institution-set standards are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement and expected performance levels are appropriate for a higher education institution. The standards are disaggregated by demographic data as well as mode of delivery and other variables sufficient to help the campus with program and institution level planning and in evaluating how well the campus is fulfilling its mission. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness analyzes the performance of the College on the institution-set standards including student achievement as evidenced by the Institution-Set Standards Data Set 2014 and 2015. The standards and the data are reviewed on an annual basis by a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, as evidenced by the subcommittee meeting minutes from December 9, 2014. Appropriate measures for improving performance on the institution set standards are discussed and approved through a process described in the document “Process for Evaluation
and Improvement of the Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement and after approval by the President are reported to the campus and community in the Mission Learning Report, evidenced by the Mission Learning Report 2014.

The methodology used to develop the standards is valid. Some of the standards are easily achievable such as the degree completion rate, and the College has discussions about modifications to standards on an individual basis.

**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).

___ X___ 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:**

The Credit hours and program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education, and verified through the curriculum review process by the Curriculum Committee and listed on the COR in the Electronic Curriculum Development System (ECD). The standards for credit hours are listed in the Curriculum handbook and the tabulation is included in the COR, utilizing Carnegie hours. These standards are verified for classroom, DE, lab and clinical courses.

Fees and costs are delineated in the college catalog. Students are also informed in the catalog that instructional materials fees may be required, as well as in orientations before the semester and on the bookstore site.
Tuition is consistent across degree programs and any instructional fees are appropriate.

**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:**

The transfer of credit policies are established by the District in Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. The college maintains articulation agreements with public and private accredited institutions both in-state and out-of-state. Transfer policies are in the catalog including information about how the college accepts credit for transfer,

**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.

_ X_ The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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:
The college does not offer correspondence courses, as verified by the Course Outlines of Record and the DE Addendum.

The institution offers both online and hybrid courses, and has developed and posted a Guideline for Regular, and Substantive Contact and has included it into the DE Addendum for approval. The DE Committee has developed a system of super-users and rubrics to provide training and support for evaluators of Distance Education course and instructors.

Information on accessibility in also on the DE website the LAMC Distance Learning Guide provides a lengthy explanation of the requirements with examples of how to meet them. LACCD has developed an Online Absentee Policy, which is posted in the Guidelines. New DE courses are reviewed and approved separately, as per Title 5, Section 55206 through the use of the Distance Education New Course Notification Form.

User authentication is met through a secure log-in and password.

These policies are also clearly stated in the Mission College Distance Education Instruction Policy.

The college provided the Commission with advance notice of intent to offer more than 50% of courses in a degree or certificate through the Substantive Change proposal of 2011.

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:**

Accreditation information is one click away from the College home page. Complaint information is easily located through the College website search and in the catalog. The complaint files were reviewed and all were documented thoroughly and were resolved.

**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:**

It was evident that the College was updating information on the website during the team visit. They should continue, as a few webpages need to be updated or removed.
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.

-X- 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.

-X- 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, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.

-X- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations and the Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV.

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

Conclusion Check-Off:

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

-N- 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.

-N- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The District’s annual OMB A-133 audit is used to determine compliance with major Federal programs such as Title IV. The College monitors and manages its funds as evidenced by no negative findings in the past three years’ external audits. The most current official three-year cohort default rate for the college is 16.4% well within the acceptable range.
STANDARD I
MISSION, ACADEMIC QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEGRITY

Standard I.A: Mission

General Observations


*Los Angeles Mission College is committed to the success of our students. The College provides accessible, affordable, high quality learning opportunities in a culturally and intellectually supportive environment by:*

- Ensuring that students successfully transfer to four-year institutions, prepare for successful careers in the workplace, and improve their basic skills;
- Encouraging students to become critical thinkers and lifelong learners; and
- Providing services and programs that improve the lives of the diverse communities we serve.

In addition, Standard I.A discusses the new Mission Statement approved by the LACCD Board in October 2015 for academic year 2016-2017.

The 2016-2017 Mission Statement reads:

*Los Angeles Mission College is committed to the success of its students. The College, which awards associate degrees and certificates, provides accessible, affordable, high-quality learning opportunities in a culturally and intellectually-supportive environment by:*

- Providing services and programs in basic skills, general education, career and technical education, and for transfer;
- Educating students to become critical thinkers and lifelong learners;
- Ensuring that all programs and services are continuously evaluated and improved to support student learning and achievement; and
- Making traditional and distance education learning opportunities available to enhance the health and wellness of the diverse communities it serves.

The old and the new mission statements both place an emphasis on the commitment of the College to student success. The statements also describe LAMC’s broad educational purpose of awarding degrees and certificates, transfer preparation, and career and technical education. The 2016-2017 mission statement also includes educating students to be critical thinkers and lifelong learners. The mission statement defines its student population as the traditional and distance education learners coming from the diverse communities it serves.
Findings and Evidence

The Los Angeles Mission College mission statement defines its broad educational goals as a California Community College. Instructional programs and services at LAMC are aligned with its mission statement and its student population, its character, and its educational goals with an emphasis on student learning and success. The 2016-2017 mission statement added an emphasis on continuous evaluation and improvement of all programs and services with emphasis on student learning and achievement which is in alignment with ACCJC standards.

The mission statement was last approved by the LACCD Board in October of 2012, with the new mission statement having been approved October 2015 and taking effect for the 2016-2017 academic year. The discussion of the new mission statement was broad-based, with two alternative versions (one by the Educational Planning Committee and one by the Academic Senate) discussed at the Los Angeles Mission College Council retreat on August 28, 2015. It was proposed and adopted in 2013 that the Academic Senate conducts an annual review of the mission statement as evidenced by the Los Angeles Mission College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes Thursday, Dec. 5, 2013. The mission statement review process was modified at the LAMC retreat in 2014 “College Council deemed the process somewhat cumbersome, and modified it to streamline the review, approval and vetting. College Council also revised the timeline so that review of the mission statement will take place during the spring term beginning in spring 2015, to allow for any changes to be approved in time to ensure the statement continues to drive strategic planning, is included in the next year’s catalog, and is disseminated campus-wide.” Some minor punctuation differences were noted in the current mission statement in a few of its public displays (No punctuation at the end of the first paragraph in the 2015-2016 College Catalog, “…” in the 2015 Fall Semester Schedule of Classes, and “:” on the LAMC college website), but they were irrelevant to its informational content and the text was the same. (I.A.1, ER 6)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) provides data and research to assess the effectiveness of LAMC in meeting its mission. Data is embedded in the Institutional Set Standards (ISS), student and faculty surveys, student achievement results, and assessment of learning outcomes. The Program Review, the keystone for linking planning, budget, and mission, is well informed by data. The Program Review template includes data on numerous factors relevant to the mission of the college and dialog is required. The Strategic Master Plan goals are broadly discussed and reviewed at College Council planning retreats. One difficulty in determining how effective the College is in implementing its mission at the campus-wide and longer time-frame scale is the large number of plans. This is a problem that the college is aware of and which they have addressed in their QFE. The large number of plans makes it more difficult to determine which measure of effectiveness is current and appropriate. The use of data, however, is clear and broad based in the determination of effectiveness. (I.A.2)

LAMC assures the alignment of its programs and services with its mission primarily in two places; College Council Retreats and Program Review. Resource allocation and planning are guided by the mission during the Program Review process, and reviewed by the Budget and Planning Council. OIE provides data throughout the process with student learning and achievement data inherent to the process. (I.A.3)
The current mission statement was approved by the governing board in October 2012, with a new mission statement broadly reviewed and approved in October of 2015 to take effect in the 2016-2017 school year. LAMC has instituted an annual process for review of the mission statement in a broad based and inclusive manner. The mission statement is widely published on the website and in campus publications. (I.A.4, ER 6)

Conclusions

The College has a board-approved mission statement that describes the mission, the intended students, and the goals of the college. Program reviews are central to planning and budget at LAMC, and are tied directly into the mission of the college. The program reviews are data driven and implemented campus wide on a three-year cycle. The mission statement is widely published and available to the campus and the public and reviewed on an annual basis. The College meets the standards and Eligibility Requirements.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College simplify the planning documentation and procedures as delineated in the Quality Focus Essay.
(I.A.2, I.B.9, III.D.2, ER 19)

Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

LAMC has demonstrated a sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about student learning outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. This is seen through the multiple efforts under way at LAMC in learning outcome assessment and reporting, the program review process, the basic skills initiative, and LAMC’s participation in Achieving the Dream. The campus dialog on student learning and achievement is broad-based and tied in to achieving campus goals and budget.

Institutional planning is clearly documented at the district level in the 2013 District Governance and Functions Handbook. As shown in the handbook, integration with District planning starts with the LACCD Strategic Plan Vision 2017 (DSP). Created collaboratively among key constituent groups from the college, the DSP generally integrates all the college strategic plans by establishing a common framework through four overarching goals. The most consistent alignment, however, occurs through the annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports that are reported to the Board of Trustees. Using a standard report template and common metrics and data sources developed collegially by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), the colleges map 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.

Findings and Evidence

Academic quality is assessed, discussed through broad based campus committees, and improved on an ongoing basis through multiple avenues. Student Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes are discussed at department and discipline meetings and discussions captured in minutes and reflected in Program Review. The Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (LOAC) produces broad based communications of results, and assesses compliance with Learning Outcome completion with strong follow up with individuals not completing work in a timely fashion, as evidenced by sample email communications. Departmental SLO reports are posted online, and departmental representative’s present reports to the LOAC per discussion at the September 23rd 2015 LOAC meeting. LAMC efforts for improving student achievement and student learning are ongoing and sustained through multiple initiatives such as Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), Achieving the Dream (AtD), and implementation of the Colleges Student Equity Plan (SEP). Academic quality assessment and improvement are integral to the program review process and integrated with budget allocation. (I.B.1)

LAMC has defined and assessed student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student support services, and the results are documented in program review and online in the Colleges website. Evidence was found documenting discussion of SLO’s at the departmental level in the Sample of Minutes from Social Sciences Department Meetings 2013-2014 from the Online SLO System. Evidence was found of discussion of changes in math department courses based on SLO assessment results in LOAC minutes from March 26, 2014. Evidence provided in the form of e-mails demonstrates a robust process led by the LOAC of increasing pressure on non-compliant individuals to enforce SLO policies and practices across the campus. Student Services units have Service Area Outcomes and SLO’s which are assessed at least every 3 years. A random sampling of program review plans from the LAMC website found all instructional programs making use of the data. Examination of Student Services Area Outcomes found that some areas did not have up to date assessments. Assessments are posted on the SLO Online System and summarized in department chair reports and in Program Review. The College summary of progress in outcome assessment is included in the Mission Learning Report and publicized on the campus website. (I.B.2, ER 11)

The College has set Institution-Set Standards (ISS’s) which are assessed and used to gauge College performance against a metric of 95% of the 5 year average as a starting point with discussion by the committee for finalization and ratification by Council of Instruction, Educational Planning Committee, and Academic Senate. Job placement rates for completers of each program had a standards set of 90% of performance goal established by the state. The results are shared with the campus community on an annual basis by the Academic Senate. The evidence is documented in meeting minutes for the Research Advisory Task Force, the College Council, Academic Senate subcommittee and Council of Instruction. LAMC includes the results in its planning process and in program review to bring about improvements and publishes the results in the LAMC Mission Learning Report which is available on the college website. CTE
programs set goals and expectations on an annual basis, and results are also communicated through the Mission Learning Report. (I.B.3, ER 11)

Assessment data are central to the Program Review and include program data with ISS’s, learning outcomes assessment data and student achievement data. Resource requests start in Program Review and are linked to objectives and Strategic Master Plan goals. All faculty and staff positions must be included in the requesting areas’ program review or the position is not considered. Some faculty positions are approved but hired the following year, but the majority are hired the year approved. The Program Review includes a checkbox to indicate if an objective is tied to improving SLO/PLO/SAO results in the program. Resource allocations are based on this data, and examples were provided of funding allocations made in response to assessment results. (I.B.4)

The College has Program Review at the center of its efforts to use assessment of the accomplishment of the college mission and the linkage between budget, mission, goals and objectives, and student learning and achievement. The online program review is well-developed and includes links to relevant information on mission, goals, objectives, outcomes, and is well informed with data. Information is aggregated and discussed in a process developed by the PROC which is broken down by Vice Presidents’ area of responsibility and summarized by each VP. The College uses extensive quantitative data provided by the OIE, as well as some qualitative data, primarily in the annual student surveys and in narrative provided in program review by the relevant areas. (I.B.5)

Institutional Learning Outcomes data is disaggregated and reported to the campus by the OIE in a report available to the campus on the website. Evidence in the form of screenshots and discussion with OIE have shown that software has been developed and data collection has begun for student SLO data at the level of individual student with the intent of disaggregation of SLO data. Achievement data is disaggregated by various subpopulations in multiple reporting formats including Program Review, the LAMC Mission Learning Report and reported on an annual basis. The LAMC Student Equity Plan is aligned with State mandates and is updated on an annual basis. The Student Equity website includes links to the reports, to data, and to campus based research. The SEP includes disaggregated data which is primarily achievement data, but it is used to formulate goals and evaluate activities and outcomes. (I.B.6)

Program Review is the center of LAMC efforts to evaluate effectiveness of the institution. The Program Review Oversight Committee establishes and evaluates Program Review policies and practices across the college. The campus reviewed and revised the mission statement policy by adding an annual review requirement. Campus practices are evaluated in a number of places including Outcomes Assessment within Program Review, Educational Planning Committee, Learning Outcome Assessment Committee, Student Support Services Committee, and Budget and Planning Committee. Committee function is evaluated by the Shared Governance Oversight Committee. (I.B.7)

The College reports assessment and evaluation results to the LACCD Board in the Annual College Effectiveness Report and the District Strategic Plan. In addition, the College reports assessment and evaluation information in the Mission Learning Report which is discussed in
committee meetings and is on the campus SLO and OIE websites. The Program Review includes annual Strength/Weakness/Opportunities/Threats analysis for each program. The OIE also serves as a hub for disseminating information on assessment and evaluation data. (I.B.8)

The LAMC planning process is broad based and inclusive almost to a point of making the process ineffective. The college has a variety of planning documents that are produced by multiple campus constituencies on different timelines. The College is aware of how this situation has led to confusion on the planning process and made planning and assessment of accomplishments confusing. They are addressing this problem in the Quality Focus Essay (QFE). (I.B.9, ER 19)

Conclusions

Los Angeles Mission College shows a strong commitment to assuring academic quality and institutional effectiveness in support of its mission. The key to much of this effort is the Program Review and related data and analysis. The planning and budget allocations are tied to the mission through the program review process, but are hindered by having multiple planning documents that are focused on different areas and conducted by different campus constituencies and with multiple timelines. They have included addressing this in the QFE and are aware of the problem. The College meets all the Standards and related Eligibility Requirements except for Standard I.B.4.

Recommendations

Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the standards and as noted by the College in its Quality Focus Essay, the Team recommends that the College provide appropriate, reliable and equitable support services to all students. In addition, the Team recommends training staff to improve the design and assessment of service area outcomes to continuously improve student support programs and services. (I.B.4, II.C.1, II.C.2, II.C.3, II.C.5, ER 15)

I.B.9, ER 19 See I.A.2

Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity

General Observations

The Los Angeles Mission College Institutional Self Evaluation Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation Standard I.C contained evidence and narrative for each standard. Of the fourteen subsections of Standard I.C, two were not relevant to LAMC (I.C.10 and I.C.11). The LAMC College catalog, schedule, and website provide clear and understandable information about the College’s mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, policies, and student support services. The Institution has procedures in place to ensure accuracy of the information it publishes, and the College communicates matters of academic quality and its accreditation status to students and the public. The College also has policies and procedures in place that promote academic integrity and communication of compliance with Eligibility
Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. Overall, members of the LAMC College community act honestly, ethically, collaboratively, and fairly in carrying out the work of the College.

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

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

At the District, a careful review of the historical documents related to accreditation reveals that LACCD adheres to the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements and Standards. The District website maintains a Planning and Accreditation webpage whereby the District publicly discloses information regarding accreditation. All college Self Evaluation Reports are posted to the website as well as District responses and evidence for the reports. Recent follow-up reports and correspondence from the Commission are also posted. The Educational Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division in the Educational Services Center (ESC) provides support and coordination for college accreditation efforts. In particular, EPIE assists college personnel in coordinating accreditation efforts for comprehensive site visits and midterm and progress reports; provides college accreditation leaders information in support of District wide accreditation issues; monitors college progress in responding to Commission recommendations; serves as liaison to the Board of Trustees and the chancellor on all issues related to college accreditation; coordinates the production, review, and revision of the “Functional Map” of District/college responsibilities and duties; monitors and interprets ACCJC Standards and policies; and coordinates responses to accreditation standards that reference multi-college District or District-level functions. Much of this coordinating effort occurs in the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), which is comprised of the colleges’ ALOs, faculty leaders with accreditation and planning, deans of institutional research and planning, District Academic Senate appointees, representatives from District Committees, and ESC administrators.

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

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

Findings and Evidence

Regularly updated information about Los Angeles Mission College is available to the public through the College website, the annually published College catalog, posters, and the class schedule; which is published each semester. LAMC’s catalog and website contain information about the College’s courses, programs, degrees, certificates, learning outcomes, student support services, and mission statement. Los Angeles Mission College provides students and prospective students with a print and online catalog that is accurate and contains information related to general College requirements regarding admission, student fees/costs, and major policies affecting students as required by Eligibility Requirement 20. Student learning outcomes are included in syllabi, which are available in the online schedule.

The College has a defined process to ensure the catalog information is accurate. The catalog is produced by a task force consisting of scheduling staff, an academic affairs dean, the faculty chair of the Curriculum Committee, and the Articulation Officer. Department chairs review their respective catalog sections for accuracy, updates, and corrections, and the graphic designer provides an overall review as well. The Quality Focus Essay states the College’s intention to form an Integrated Planning Committee that will focus on the analysis and realignment of College planning. Anticipated benefits from this project include streamlined processes, improved alignment, with the Strategic Master Plan, and integrated communication; all which will aid with accuracy. (I.C.1; ER 20)

General information is provided to the public and students in the online and print catalog, including the official institution name, address, phone numbers, website address, and the name and contact information of the College’s accrediting body. Other information presented in the catalog includes: an academic freedom statement, available student financial aid, program length, requirements for admission, degrees, certificates, graduation, transfer, fees and financial obligations, and learning resources. Policies affecting students, including academic honesty,
nondiscrimination, acceptance of transfer credits, grievance and complaint procedures, sexual harassment, and refund of fees are also provided. The names and credentials of faculty and administrators and the members of the Board of Trustees are presented after the President’s welcome letter. The 2015-2016 print and online college catalog contains all the required Eligibility Requirement elements, with the exception of an academic calendar.

The semester schedule of classes contains an academic calendar, the mission statement, general information, policy information, support services, address, website address, phone numbers, and members of the Board of Trustees and District and College administration. Also included in the schedule is information about online and hybrid class formats, the accelerated weekend college program, and the non-credit program. Non-credit program information is presented in both Spanish and English. (I.C.2; ER 20)

Academic quality is communicated to the College community, the public, and prospective students. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) websites contain numerous reports that document how the College is performing in the areas of student learning and academic quality. These reports and documents include: Student Success and Grade Distribution, Degrees and Certificates Awarded, Mission Learning Report, course completion data, transfer data, CTE Employment Outcomes Survey, student and faculty surveys, Student Success Scorecard, IPEDS, SLO Assessments with Modifications Reports, Follow-Up and Resource Allocation Reports, and departmental SLO and PLO Reports. The College’s commitment to continuous improvement of student learning and achievement is evidenced through discussions at Academic Senate and Council of Instruction meetings, Department Chair SLO/PLO Summary Reports, Departmental Follow-Up Reports, and Strategic Planning Retreat documentation. (I.C.3; ER 19)

The course catalog and College website outline the College’s certificate and degrees, course requirements, and learning outcomes. Some discipline websites also provide certificate, degree, and other programmatic information. Syllabi for traditional modality and online courses are posted in the online schedule and include student learning outcomes. (I.C.4)

At the District, the Los Angeles Community College Administrative Regulation C-12 TOPIC: Chancellor Review of Board Rules Administration Regulations and Procedural Guidelines provides a timeline and process for the District level review of all rules, regulations, and procedures. The Self Evaluation Report notes that at the College level, shared governance committees regularly review the College Mission, policies, and procedures. Planning documents, governance body meeting minutes, and campus interviews provide evidence of ongoing review. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness website houses the planning document linkage chart, integrated planning chart, and LAMC Office of Institutional Effectiveness Research Calendar. Although the District has a policy for the use of computers by students, faculty and staff; LAMC does not have guideline or schedules for updating faculty or discipline websites. (1.C.5)

Los Angeles Mission College provides current and prospective students information regarding the cost of education in the College catalog, Eagles Landing Bookstore website, and via the Financial Aid website. The College catalog provides written descriptions of the fees and
expenses students typically incur. These include: enrollment fee, health services fee, associated
student's organization fee, instructional materials, parking fee, student representation fee, and
transcript and verification fees. Refund information and enrollment fee assistance information is
also provided. The catalog includes a chart for international student expenses with costs
presented per semester and for a year. The College also maintains a Financial Aid Net Price
Calculator and scholarship website. (I.C.6)

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)

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)

LACCD Board Rule 15002, the 2014-2017 LACCD and AFT Faculty Guild Collective Bargaining
Agreement, and the LAMC Senate Faculty Ethics Statement address faculty responsibilities. The
Faculty Ethics Statement provides evidence that faculty are expected to distinguish between
personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. The Faculty Ethics
Statement is in the College catalog (p.11) and states:

Community college faculty members, guided by a devout conviction of the worth and
dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed
upon them. Their primary responsibility to their students is to seek and to state the truth
as they see it. To this end, faculty members devote their energies to developing and
improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-
discipline and judgement in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge.

Review of the course outlines of record (COR) provide a process for ensuring that official course
content represents professionally accepted views in a discipline. During interviews, department chairs confirmed that discussions about COR and faculty responsibilities regularly occur. Faculty performance evaluations and student evaluations also provide feedback on whether a faculty member is presenting course material objectively. The District administers a survey that asks students to what extent they agree that instructor’s present information fairly and objectively, distinguishing between personal convictions and professionally accepted views. At the last administration, 93.7% of the students surveyed strongly agreed or agreed with this statement. (I.C.9)

The College provides accessible and clear notice of policies for specific codes of conduct in the catalog and on the College website. Standards of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Action are in the College catalog and detail student’s responsibilities. The Self Evaluation Report states that Standard I.C.10 is not applicable as the College does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct other than those published in the College catalog. (I.C.10)

The College does not operate outside of the United States. (I.C.11)

Los Angeles Mission College has a visible link on the College website to an accreditation page that includes information on its accreditation status, Commission action letters, Self Evaluation Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and campus communication related to accreditation updates. The College also maintains historical accreditation records in the College library and states on page three of the College catalog that it is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The address and telephone number of the Commission office are provided. Los Angeles Mission College coordinated its internal accreditation activities through the College Accreditation Steering Committee. The committee membership was broad-based and included all College constituents. The Self Evaluation Report was sent to the entire campus community, and a summary of the report was presented at LAMC’s Academic Senate and College Council, where third party comments were solicited. The College has a Student Complaints/Grievance page on its website, which allows for online complaint submissions. LAMC has maintained compliance with Commission ERs, Standards, policies, guidelines, institutional reporting, team visits, and substantive change requirements. The College’s accredited status is appropriately displayed on the College website and in printed materials such as the College catalog. The College communicates matters of educational quality and institutional effectiveness through reports posted on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness website. Governance body meeting minutes indicate that disclosure regarding effectiveness and compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission polices is documented. Additionally, the March 2016 Self Evaluation Report includes a certification statement that the Self Evaluation Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of the Institution. (I.C.12)

LAMC demonstrates integrity in its relationships with external agencies, The Self Evaluation Report and the accreditation website include evidence that documents the College’s responsiveness to direction from the ACCJC. The 2015 Follow-Up Report identifies action taken by the College to correct earlier deficiencies. The College submits required ACCJC reports in a timely manner. (I.C.13)
The College offers a variety of programs to address the needs of its student population. These programs align with its mission. The College maintains instructional effectiveness through the work of the Educational Planning Committee, the program review process, the curriculum approval process, and assessment of SLOs/PLOs/ILOs. The College also supports professional development activities and pedagogy workshops. Student achievement and learning data is disaggregated, and the College publishes reports with specific actions to improve key metrics. The College is not a for profit entity. (I.C.14)

The Board is responsible for policy and exercises oversight over student success, persistence, retention, and quality (BR 2100). The Board exercises oversight of the District’s educational programs and has established an Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee to monitor the integrity, quality, and improvement of student learning programs and services (I.C.14). The Board of Trustees is kept regularly informed on key indicators of student learning and achievement through the IESS. Additionally, Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review of the colleges’ academic quality and institutional plans. The annual review and analysis of the state’s Student Success Scorecard completion data and the resultant Board discussion has focused on strategies for improving student success and academic quality. (I.C.14)

Conclusions

Los Angeles Mission College demonstrates a commitment to institutional integrity through the clear presentation of accurate information that is provided in online and print formats. LAMC assesses student learning, evaluates student achievement, and communicates information about academic quality in a number of reports including the Mission Learning Report, the Strategic Master Plan, and departmental SLO and PLO reports. Student achievement and learning data is disaggregated, and the College publishes reports with specific action plans to improve key metrics. The Institution demonstrates responsiveness and compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies and guidelines.

The team commends the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for producing high quality research and analysis to support data-driven decision-making at the College, and the College for the clarity of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness webpage, which is easy to navigate and provides access to relevant and important information related to institutional planning and evaluation, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

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.
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.

The Board of Trustees’ IESS committee keeps the colleges informed on issues involving academic quality, student achievement, and student learning. The District meets this Standard.

The College meets the Standard except for I.C.2 and ER 20.

Recommendations

Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College add an academic calendar to the catalog. (I.C.2, ER 20)

Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a process for reviewing instructional department websites to ensure that information on those sites is clear, accurate, and consistent with College policies and procedures. (I.C.1)
STANDARD II
STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

General Observations

Los Angeles Mission College maintains student learning programs and support services that are assessed for quality and currency. Its faculty ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet accepted academic standards. The faculty continuously improve courses and programs through systematic evaluation. It has regular review of its courses, its programs, its degrees, and its certificates. Additionally, the college has institutional learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and institutional level student learning outcomes that are assessed on a regular three-year cycle.

The delivery modes, teaching methodologies, and learning support services at Los Angeles Mission College reflect the diversity of its students and support equity. For each of the college’s degree programs, there is a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy. Graduates of career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate competencies that meet employment standards.

Course quality and rigor are evaluated and approved for all modalities at Los Angeles Mission College. Distance Education courses meet the same requirements as face to face courses, are approved separately as required, employ a secure log-in an password for authentication, and faculty are made aware of regular, substantive standards of contact and ADA compliance.

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

Findings and Evidence

The programs offered at Los Angeles Mission College are consistent with its mission, appropriate to higher education, (with supporting courses in basic skills) and lead to certificates, degrees, and transfer. Curriculum is reviewed and approved through the state chancellor’s office and the College Curriculum Committee. All CORs include SLOs, as evidenced in the Electronic Curriculum Development system (ECD). (II.A.1, ER9 and ER11)

Los Angeles Mission College updates its Course Outlines of Record every six years as required by the Chancellor’s Office. Career and Technical Education courses are reviewed every two years and updated when necessary conform to industry guidelines. The syllabi shared with students meet the requirements of the Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees and are publicly available online. These syllabi also include the course’s student learning outcomes.
Evaluation of faculty member includes the requirement of participation in assessing student learning outcomes. (II.A.2)

The improvement of teaching and learning at Los Angeles Mission College is supported by the college’s professional development offerings. Most of the offerings that are specific to faculty are provided by the Eagle’s Nest. The workshops offered include those centered on pedagogy and those centered on student success. The college also has annual Flex Days as well as an SLO Summit. A PLO Summit is scheduled for fall 2016. (II.A.2)

The quality of instructional programs at Los Angeles Mission College is ensured by the oversight of several committees and processes established by the college. The college’s program review process supplies a framework for systematic evaluation and continuous improvement of course and programs. The Educational Planning Committee reviews and gives recommendations and commendations for each of the program review documents that are submitted each year. (II.A.2)

Los Angeles Mission College identifies and regularly assesses student learning outcomes for its courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. It has online management systems to house the data. SLO assessment began in 2007 and has been ongoing. The Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (LOAC) maintains the assessment schedule on its website. The Course Outline of Record for each course includes the student learning outcomes and program learning outcomes for the course. The college’s SLO website is a repository for a wealth of information. Publicly available is SLO data, including assessments, and information about the use of results. (II.A.3)

Los Angeles Mission College offers pre-collegiate courses in support of Math, English, and ESL. Course Sequence tables are provided for students in the catalog for each area. Pre-collegiate courses are listed in the Schedule of Courses and differentiated from college level courses by the exception of the transfer notation. Pre-collegiate courses are approved through the same curriculum approval process as college level courses, and CORs are posted in the Electronic Curriculum Development System, and courses are described in the college catalog. (II.A.4)

Los Angeles Mission College offers 13 transfer degrees that meet the degree requirements through the Chancellor’s Office. Courses and units are based on the Carnegie hour and consistent with common practice and verification of credit hour is included in the COR. Programs are at least 60 units, and all length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, synthesis of learning, and critical thinking are evidenced within the COR and verified by the Curriculum Committee. (II.A.5, ER 12)

Los Angeles Mission College offers courses in a manner that allows students to complete in a time frame consistent with established expectations. Most students in LAMC take 4 years to complete a 2-year degree, but this is consistent with the other colleges in the district. A Strategic Enrollment Management Plan has been developed with guiding principles for the scheduling of courses and is currently being updated by the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee—a committee with representatives from faculty, student services, and administration. (II.A.6, ER 9)
Los Angeles Mission College has a Student Equity Plan that has been reviewed by the Chancellor’s Office that identifies gaps in achievement and proposes solutions to target those populations that are disproportionally impacted. The college delivers education using face-to-face, hybrid, and online methods. When a course is offered in more than one modality, the different modalities are compared to ensure consistency and equity. Coordination between Disabled Student Programs and Services and academic disciplines ensure that students with special needs are accommodated. (II.A.7)

Smart classrooms are used at Los Angeles Mission College; and field trips, embedded tutors, and supplemental instruction are integrated into courses. The diverse and changing needs of students are reflected in the college’s learning support services. These include offerings from Disabled Students Programs and Services, both face-to-face and online tutoring, and cultural events. The college participates in Achieving the Dream, as well. (II.A.7)

Several Mathematics and Biology Lab courses at Los Angeles Mission College use a common exam. The Math Department has developed clear instructions to the faculty on process as well as a rubric for scoring in order to enhance the reliability of the exam. There is substantial evidence of discussions of the validity and reliability of the examinations in the Math Department, including additional discussions on the placement of SLO questions and timing of exams. Results are used for decision making in the department. (II.A.8)

Each Course Outline of Record and Program at Los Angeles Mission College includes approved SLOs and PLOs. CORs include listings of assessment tools that are used to verify the student acquisition of SLOs and PLOs. The college offerings follow federal guidelines for clock-to-credit hour conversions and unit credits are consistent with the norms in higher education, as evidenced in the CORs and approved by the Curriculum Committee. (II.A.9, ER10)

The Los Angeles Mission College transfer of credit policies are stated in the catalog. The Academic Exception Petition is utilized to transfer credits to the college from other institutions, and the form requires the department chair and counselor signature for completion. The process is clearly stated in the Discipline Advisor’s Handbook. The Transfer Admissions Guarantees (TAGs) and other articulation agreements are listed in ASSIST. (II.A.10, ER10)

The District has well-established policies and regulations in place for acceptance of a wide range of transfer credits including: standardized tests, external exams, International Baccalaureate, military credits, Advanced Placement, courses completed at international institutions, and acceptance of upper division courses to meet lower division requirements. These policies align with state regulations, the policies of California State University and University of California, and other transfer institutions, as well as with generally accepted practices in higher education. This information is published in the college catalogs and websites. The awarding of transfer credits is the responsibility of each college and is reflected on the student’s permanent record, maintained in the Student Information System (DAC). Each college currently issues its own student transcripts; however, this will change with the new PeopleSoft system where there will be one District transcript reflecting credits taken throughout the District. There is no District monitoring of the consistency of the awarding of transfer credits. (II.A.10)
The information presented to students in college publications is thorough and comprehensive. While some colleges specified that they do not specifically examine student learning outcomes in the process of evaluating transfer credits, the acceptance of transfer credits by the institutions implies that the expected learning outcomes are comparable. (II.A.10)

Each of the nine colleges maintained articulation agreements with public and private accredited institutions both in-state and out-of-state. These agreements are contained in ASSIST, the state’s recognized articulation database for use by students and employees that advise students. The establishment and maintenance of articulation agreements is the responsibility of the college faculty. The District does not have a role in developing articulation agreements. (II.A.10)

The Los Angeles Mission College Catalog includes program learning outcomes. The college has stated institutional learning outcomes that include the areas of communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage in diverse perspectives. The ILOs in the areas of communication competency and ethical reasoning are currently in the process of revision. (II.A.11)

All of the Associate Degrees at Los Angeles Mission College require a component of general education. Both Associate Degrees and Transfer Model Curriculum require a minimum of 18 semester units in general education. The college’s Curriculum Committee reviews all general education courses to evaluate their appropriateness. All general education courses are also linked to the college’s institutional learning outcomes. (II.A.12)

Los Angeles Mission College offers 57 instructional programs that lead to an Associate Degree, and each focuses on a specialized area of study. The college states that institutional learning outcomes are addressed in all courses and disciplines, but this statement needs to be verified. The review of degree and certificate requirements is done by faculty during the Program Review Process. (II.A.13)

Los Angeles Mission College offers Associate of Arts Degrees, Associate of Science Degrees, and Certificates of Achievement in several CTE fields. All CTE disciplines have advisory committees that meet annually. All vocational and occupational programs at the college undergo biennial review to ensure that the program meets labor market demand, does not duplicate another program, and is effective as measured by employment and completion success of its students. Currently, the online Program Review system used by the college, however, does not include data on other programs in the immediate surrounding area. (II.A.14)

Los Angeles Mission College has a Viability Review of Educational Programs process that is posted on the Senate Program Viability Website. The process includes outcomes, lists of data to be gathered, and a delineated process for completion. The Curriculum Committee informs the campus of any course or program changes through its website and counselors assist students with the petition process for course substitution in order to assure their continuation to their goal with a minimum of disruption. (II.A.15)

Los Angeles Mission College’s Educational Master Plan is reviewed regularly to improve the
quality and currency of instructional programs. All programs at the college are evaluated for quality and currency through the college’s program review process. This process includes both faculty and the Curriculum Committee. The curriculum review process includes faculty reflection on improvements to enhance learning outcomes and student achievement. (II.A.16)

Los Angeles Mission College uses a program viability process to assess both new and existing programs. It initiates from the Educational Planning Committee. This process has recently resulted in the suspension of the Cooperative Education program and in the realignment of courses from the Family and Consumer Sciences Department to various existing departments. (II.A.16)

**Conclusion**

A review of Los Angeles Mission College’s student learning programs and support services shows that the college states that it has policies and procedures in place for comprehensive review of these programs for quality. Additionally, learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level are in place and assessed. The college has a tested and reliable method of curriculum development and approval and ensures that courses offered in all modalities meet state and federal requirements, are rigorous yet appropriate in length, and lead to completion goals. Quality courses are offered in Basic Skills, Transfer, CTE and Distance Education. The College meets this standard.

The District meets the Standard and ER 10. Transfer of credit policies are clearly communicated to students in various college publications, including the college catalog and websites, to facilitate the mobility of students from one institution to another without penalty. While the District does not specifically assess student learning outcomes of transferred courses since the outcomes are not readily available, the college reviews required prerequisites, course content and knowledge gained in transferred courses to determine equivalency. Moreover, by accepting transfer credits in accordance with Board polices, the college has determined that the learning outcomes for the transferred courses are comparable to the courses at the college.

The colleges all have numerous articulation agreements in place and rely on ASSIST as the primary repository of those agreements. The development and maintenance of articulation agreements is the responsibility of the individual college faculty. The District does not have a role.
Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The College offers a wide array of library services to support student learning and achievement, both onsite and online. Services and resources are adequate in quantity, depth, and variety. Resources include a physical collection of 52,228 books, reserve textbooks, media, online databases, electronic books, Libguides, and regularly scheduled research workshops. Library service area outcomes are well-defined, and generally support the information competency institutional learning outcome. The library program review is comprehensive and current.

The Library Collection Development Plan allows for opportunities for instructional faculty and librarian expertise to be included in the selection of materials to support student learning. This includes library involvement in the curriculum approval process. The library mission statement clearly outlines the role of the library “through access to organized collections and information” in achieving the mission of the College.

The library participates in the program review process, assesses services through SAOs, and plans improvements based on assessment. There are several self-identified constraints in the program review including lack of physical space and budget resources, but librarians and other library staff have tried to introduce improvements including additional computer stations and several online databases including Learning Express.

The library participates in the CCLC cooperative acquisitions agreement for electronic databases. Students have an opportunity to request materials from other LACCD libraries and have them delivered to the College. The IT department assumes responsibility for network security, reliability and maintenance of library and learning center computer equipment. Physical security measures include library security gates and L.A. County Sheriff patrols.

Learning support centers include tutoring, writing, math, and several discipline-specific centers. The main learning center, located on the first floor of the library building, is spacious and offers ample computer access for students. Much smaller rooms around the perimeter support ESL, writing, media, and math. The physically impressive east campus Center for Math and Science opened several years ago. Several of the centers, including the Academic Success Center and the ISSA e-lab were funded initially through a Title V HSI grant. Students enrolled in special programs such as EOPS and DSPS have access to additional learning support resources.

Learning support online currently appears uneven. The College is currently implementing Net Tutor online tutoring services, but no information on online tutoring support is listed on the learning center/tutorial webpage. There is access to Net Tutor through the distance education page. There are some grant-funded online video tutorials on the website in certain topic areas such as anatomy, but no online writing center services. Program reviews and service area outcomes for some learning centers were not evident.

Educational equipment and material selection and maintenance in the learning centers is addressed in the Technology Master Plan 2015-2019 and Technology Replacement Plan 2014-
2019. Student satisfaction with onsite learning center hardware and software is high, according to a fall 2014 survey. Other than the fall 2014 student survey, there is no evidence of program review or other systematic assessment of learning center/tutorial SAOs or resource needs.

All the colleges adhere to Board policy pertaining to intra-library loans and have strong collaboration pertaining to providing learning support for students. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance, and reliability of services provided either directly or thorough contractual arrangement. The institution regularly evaluates these services to ensure their effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The library is located on the 2nd floor of the same building that houses the main tutoring center on the first floor. Reference and circulation services are prominent and easy to access. Satisfaction with library staff and their services including the website is high with both students and faculty, based on annual library survey results listed in evidence.

An area of concern voiced by all is the currency of library resources. In response to a fall 2014 faculty/staff survey satisfaction rate of 58% with library resources, the library acquired additional electronic resources. In the 2014/15 program review, the last significant collection update is listed as 2002, and 80% of the onsite collections are at least 16 years old. In the spring 2015 survey, 85% of students surveyed said they could not find a book to support their needs, partially because instructors require that sources cited must be published within the past five years. (II.B.1)

Space and budget constraints are cited as challenges in maintaining adequate library collections onsite and online in both the library program review and collection development plan. The library has acquired additional electronic resources including Learning Express and laptop computers to try to partially address these issues. (II.B.1, II.B.2)

The library bases assessments on a variety of methods including quantitative data on materials use, orientation/workshop attendance, student and faculty/staff satisfaction surveys, and participation in assessing the information competency ILO. Improvements based on assessment include the addition of electronic resources and additional computers. One electronic addition, Libguides subject-specific resource aids, serves online students and has increased faculty satisfaction according to survey results. There are additional improvement plans that been identified including expanded physical space that would require additional resources to implement. (II.B.3)

The library has several formal documented agreements to deliver services. The CCLC Cooperative and the L.A. Mission interlibrary loan policy allow the library to provide greater access to electronic and physical resources. The library security measures are appropriate and
typical of college libraries. The IT department has responsibility for computer maintenance and replacement, including the library and learning centers/labs, as outlined in the college technology plans. (II.B. 4)

Onsite learning centers offer ample computer access and learning technology including licensed software products. Student response in a fall 2014 survey showed very high satisfaction with learning centers. There is no indication that online students were part of this survey, and no information about online tutoring on the learning center/ tutorial website. Other than the fall 2014 student survey and prior program review, there is little systematic assessment of the learning center/tutorial; the SAOs update was due in 2014. According to the dean of the area, this is due to the vacancy in the position of learning center director. This position is not shown on the College organization charts. (II.B.1, II.B.3.).

Faculty and staff satisfaction regarding the equipment and materials selection in learning centers seems high, although space restraints were mentioned in some of the centers. The maintenance/replacement of library and learning center equipment as part of technology planning is clearly outlined. The IT department is responsible for network security, computer replacement and maintenance of the learning centers. All learning center equipment appears to be in good working order. (II.B.2, II.B.4)

There is little evidence that all learning centers participate in program review or in assessing SAOs. The Reading Plus program has a pre-survey and post-survey for students. The Title V Academic Success Center has a link to take a Class Climate survey. It is unclear where the results from these surveys are housed, or how they are used for improvement planning. Evidence provided relies heavily on fall 2014 faculty/staff and student surveys. The self-evaluation mentions on page 149 that tutoring services are evaluated “at intervals” and the Math and Stem Centers use student evaluations to assess tutors and hours of service, but there has been no evidence provided. (II.B.3)

The District has a long-standing practice of collaboration for library and learning support for its instructional programs. The District has a policy that facilitates intra-library loans for its students. This reciprocal agreement allows students to request material to be sent to another library within the District, generally within one week. Students also have the option to drive to another college to pick up materials on loan. (II.B.4)

The District does not have a role in documenting formal collaborative agreements pertaining to library and other learning support services for instructional programs. The development and maintenance of these agreements is the responsibility of the individual colleges. The colleges also have subscriptions for online databases, tutoring programs, and career planning tools. The District libraries use the California Community College Library Consortium to purchase electronic resources which is the most cost-effective approach. The colleges also have reciprocal agreements with the libraries at the local California State University campuses and refer students to the local public libraries for various materials that may not be available. (II.B.4)

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

Conclusion

The L.A. Mission College Library services support student learning through onsite and online access to organized resources and information. The library offers training and workshops as well as reference services. The library assesses its trainings, collections, and services and works toward continuous improvement. The Dean and Department Chair have a plan to use categorical funds to update the collection, which is the only current area of concern. Library faculty is dedicated, very knowledgeable, and obviously committed to serving the needs of L.A. Mission College students and faculty. Implementing the current library space expansion plan to occupy the first floor of the library building would greatly assist them in their efforts.

The College has a wide scope of learning support services available onsite, with appropriate and ample technology. It is currently implementing online tutoring through Net Tutor, and there is information about the centers available online; however, information on the learning center/tutorial website needs to be current and reflect online services available. There is little or no evidence that some learning centers, such as the writing center and math lab, are assessing service area outcomes for both onsite and online services and using the results for continuous improvement. The learning center/tutorial area should be kept current in terms of program review and SAO assessment.

The District meets the Standard. The nine colleges of the District have strong collaboration with regards to library and other learning support that aligns with District policy. The colleges also collaborate with local universities and the public library system to provide library support for students. The colleges have agreements in place for online resources and services. The nine librarians meet monthly to share resources and identify needs and services for students. The colleges are responsible for the overall security and maintenance of resources, and District IT is responsible for the maintenance of the websites and software. Facilities are secured through a District wide contract with the Sherriff’s Department.

Recommendations

Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College develop a plan to evaluate all library, learning, and tutoring center services and support to students, regardless of location or means of delivery, and use the result of the evaluation as a basis for improvement. (II.B.1, II.B3)
Standard II.C: Student Support Services

General Observations

L.A. Mission College offers a comprehensive array of student services on its campus, days and evenings, online, and in some areas on weekends and at community sites. Student Services Division (SSD) units have established a three-year comprehensive program review cycle that begins at the end of February and closes the end of May. The comprehensive review form includes commendations and recommendations; program mission statement; program services and hours of operation; population served; current staffing and staffing projections; program outreach; satisfaction surveys (student and faculty/staff); student services area outcomes; professional development; facility and equipment needs; advisory/oversight committees and external accountability compliance status; planning assumptions and assessment; supplemental materials; and additional objectives and resources needed. Fifteen units in the SSD have been identified as part of the review cycle. In addition, in May 2014, the College adopted a 2014-2017 Distance Education Plan that included goals and performance measures for online student support services.

LA Mission College conducts regular student surveys, points of service surveys, and faculty/staff surveys as a primary tool of assessing the effectiveness of its services for students. In Fall 2014, the College also administered a survey of students in online courses consisting of 39 items covering internet access, goals and plans, financial resources, college services, college facilities and security, academic experiences, and online course experiences. As the majority of the SSD unit SAOs focus on the students’ understanding and awareness of resources and educational requirements, student self-reporting through these student surveys is the main tool used to assess program quality.

LA Mission College offers four intercollegiate sports: men’s soccer and baseball and women’s volleyball and softball. The Athletics Department’s program mission is to “serve students as part of the student’s general education and equip the student for success in higher education, employment and citizenship skills,” consistent with overall mission of the College. The Athletics Department provides academic advising, athletics training and rehabilitation, intercollegiate practice and competition, recruiting, conditioning training, and transportation.

The Associated Student Organization (ASO) has a stated purpose of “providing students’ the opportunity of participation and development of student leadership skills” and charters twelve active student clubs with ten or more members in each club. The clubs provide diverse opportunities for students and represent instructional programs, honor societies, and student sub-groups; the ASO promotes multiculturalism through campus-wide activities. The ASO also places students on participatory governance and hiring committees.

LA Mission College provides academic counseling to students via drop-in services and by appointment, with less time-intensive services provided through drop-in and more time-intensive services, including the development of comprehensive Student Education Plans (SEPs), provided by appointment. Academic counseling services are also provided through credit courses offered through the Counseling Department. Student can get basic counseling support by submitting questions via an online form on the Counseling Department’s webpage.
which results in an email response. Counseling services include student educational plan development; career planning; college orientations; transfer counseling; clearances for prerequisites, course repeats, and excess units; transcript evaluation and IGETC certification; and Financial Aid extensions.

In 2014-2015, 3,076 students were assessed, constituting 78% of the target population. LA Mission College uses MDTP for math assessment and COMPASS for English and ESL placement assessment. The Math, English, and ESL departments have engaged in the review of these placement tools at different times over the last 6 years. Much emphasis in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report has been placed on the new statewide Common Assessment that will replace the existing assessment tools as early as Spring 2016.

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

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

Findings and Evidence

While most SSD units have completed a comprehensive program review in the last seven years, the review cycle for units is unclear. For some program reviews, the unit is given recommendations by the Student Support Services Committee (SSSC) from the previous program review, which are documented in the initial objectives section. The unit can then evaluate services through the Service Area Outcomes (SAO) section, the Student Survey section, and the Objectives and Resources section. Many units that do not seem to have recent comprehensive program reviews have updated SAOs and resource requests; however, many planned activities did not occur or did not occur within the stated time frame. This results in few results and implementation reports. (II.C.1)

In reviewing the SSD unit program reviews, there doesn’t appear to be a clear connection between previous SSSC recommendations, student survey results, the SAOs, and the newly identified objectives and resource requests. Some units, including EOP&S and Athletics, have identified gaps in student performance, implemented interventions, and tracked measurable improvements. Other units, including Counseling and Veterans, rely primarily on student surveys for measurement but have noted an issue with limited student sample sizes in their results, which has limited their ability to evaluate services. The majority of units do not articulate in the program review report how the new objectives and resource requests are
aligned with their SAOs or student survey results. For example, two units mentioned that results from student surveys identified the need to provide additional customer service training to staff, but this training wasn’t included in their new objectives or resource requests, although training is an objective in the QFE (II.C.1)

In Spring 2014, the College implemented a Student Services Action Plan to address identified gaps in services, and this resulted in the hiring of new positions in many units. The development of a three-year distance education plan also demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement of online support services for students. That said, the Student Services comprehensive program reviews don’t directly assess the quality of services provided on-site versus online. There appears to be an overreliance on surveys to measure the effectiveness and quality of the programs and services offered to support students. For example, the Transfer Center noted in its 2014-2015 program review that there wasn’t a correlation between student satisfaction with the Center and the number of transfer resources a student can identify and use; however, no other metric was identified. Counseling and Veterans Affairs both noted the inability to evaluate some program effectiveness due to the limited number of students responding to surveys. While some units, such as Athletics and EOP&S, supplement student survey responses with quantitative student participation and performance data, most Student Services units do not include these other metrics in their assessment efforts. (II.C.2)

In addition, there is inconsistency in how effectively assessment data are used to improve programs and services in Student Services. EOP&S added evening hours in response to a need identified through student surveys, and the Counseling Department similarly developed online counseling tools. However, issues identified in 2007-2008 in the DSP&S program review were noted as late as 2013-2014 as not having been addressed. It appears that units with fewer full-time staff struggle more to complete program evaluation efforts. (II.C.2)

Admissions and Records, Assessment, Counseling, DSP&S, EOP&S, Financial Aid, Health Center, and the Transfer Center are open to students on campus during the regular work day and at least one evening each week. The Associated Student Organization (ASO), Athletics, Child Development Center, International Students Center, SSS/TRiO, and Veterans Resource Center provide services during regular work day. Academic Counseling is available online using eSARS and Zoom. Textbooks can purchased online from the bookstore. (II.C.3)

The Student Information System (SIS) allows students to complete the following tasks online: add and drop classes, check grades, access unofficial transcripts, view open courses and individual student class schedules, obtain placement results, check financial aid award status, and pay tuition fees. Students can also access additional forms through the College website to complete an athletic physical, order official transcripts, and apply to the international student program. (II.C.3)

In the last program review of the athletics program by the Western State Conference, the College was given the recommendations to (a) assign an eligibility clerk to the program through the Admissions Office, (b) create an Academic Advisor position, (c) expand the
athletics team offerings, and (d) upgrade the College’s playing facilities. The Athletics Department has also requested funding to support the creation of a study hall and tutoring program for student athletes. A part-time Academic Advisor position has been created. There is currently a joint use agreement to use a county park for a playing field facility, but the College hopes for a District bond to build a field facility on college-owned land that has been identified. (II.C.4)

The lack of coordination of athletic eligibility through the Admissions Office could lead to issues with institutional controls and program integrity. In order to ensure the College meets its mission of providing equal access to educational opportunities for all students, it must ensure that female students have equal opportunities to participate in intercollegiate sports. The College is currently out of Title IX compliance, but has plans to add women’s cross-country track in Fall 2016 and women’s soccer in Fall 2017. Longer term, it hopes to add men’s and women’s basketball. (II.C.4)

ASO and other co-curricular programs, such as musical performances and art displays, align with the programs and services. The Team was impressed with the active ASO representation and participation on College committees. A spirit of co-curricular cooperation was evident in areas such as the bookstore hosting a student art display. All athletics program and co-curricular funds are subject to the fiscal controls and procedures of the College. (II.C.4)

In 2014-2015, 10,654 students received counseling services, representing 65% of all non-exempt students at the college. Of this group, 3,829 students completed an SEP (abbreviated or comprehensive). The average wait time for drop-in services during peak registration has dropped from 38 minutes to 26 minutes; wait time for appointments has dropped to one week. This increase in the number of students receiving counseling services was due the college’s investment in one additional full-time, tenure-track counselor, two limited, twelve-month counselors, and additional adjunct counselors during this same year. Counseling services are also provided through EOPS, DSPS, and TRIO. To increase visibility of available counseling services, the Counseling Department launched a Facebook page and staffed a table during welcome week on campus. (II.C.5)

In addition to on-site counseling services, the Counseling Department uses eSARS to schedule appointments and launched an eCounseling platform, Zoom, in Fall 2015 in order to provide counseling services for distance education students. The eCounseling platform allows for email communication, virtual screen sharing, and conferencing. Orientation sessions were also held on Saturdays and at local high schools to provide greater access for new students. (II.C.5)

To ensure counselors are prepared for the advising functions, The Counseling Department holds in-service trainings for counselors. In April 2015, the Counseling Department also held a general faculty/staff training on the new Student Success and Support Program (SSSP); the Counseling Department also held a session on SSSP as a Flex Day activity. In addition, the Counseling Department supports a Discipline Advisor Program that involves faculty from instructional departments in advising students on program-specific questions, and two instructional departments participated in the program in the most recent year. In addition to the broad array of counseling services provided, the Counseling Department created an online
Career Resource Center. (II.C.5)

All L.A. Mission admissions policies adhere to applicable regulations. The transfer center website has many useful links to four-year colleges and offers regular workshops, as well as links to career resources. Onsite activities include annual Focus on Career days, Counseling Department workshops, and a particularly well-defined paralegal/law pathway. In addition, the large state-of-the-art Culinary Arts program has an impressive list of externships and high visibility as a regional career training site. (II.C.6)

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)

In 2008, the Math Department adopted the MDTP assessment tool, and cutoff scores were set in Fall 2009, then reset in Spring 2012 and Summer 2014. There is no evidence to demonstrate that student scores on the MDTP assessment were compared to student success in courses or disaggregated to determine if bias existed for student sub-groups.

In Fall 2013, ESL faculty administered a student essay comparison and determined that of 50 students sampled 77% of students were misplaced by the COMPASS tool. The Institutional Self Evaluation Report states that since 2013, when this misplacement issue was identified, the College has not changed and is waiting for the new state-wide Common Assessment to be implemented as the solution. There is also no evidence to demonstrate that the grading of the essays, or the misplacement issue with COMPASS, were disaggregated to determine if bias existed for student sub-populations. (II.C.7)

In Spring 2010, the English Department reviewed the course success rates by student course entry placement, either by taking the prerequisite course or by the COMPASS assessment tool for English 101. There is no narrative analysis as to whether student course success for placement by COMPASS was or was not comparable to the success of students who took the
prerequisite course. There is also no evidence demonstrated that the data were disaggregated to
determine if bias existed for student sub-populations. (II.C.7)

The College maintains student records securely and confidentially, both in digital and physical
form. L.A. Mission College adheres to FERPA and has established policies and processes for
the release of student records. Files are securely stored and backed up. Management of records
is overseen by the appropriate division cabinet-level administrators. (II.C.8)

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)

Conclusion

In 2013, the Student Services Division received five recommendations from ACCJC, which
led to subsequent assessment and action plans during 2014 and 2015. That led in turn to a gap
analysis that revealed three gaps and some recurring themes that that College is addressing as
part of the Quality Focus Essay (QFE) in an action project entitled Transforming Student
Services to Achieve Student Success. One of the main objectives is staff training, which will
include the use of data, program review, and SAOs assessment to support student success and
achievement. At this point in time, SSD units have clearly made efforts in this area; but they
are inconsistent, survey-based, and lack actual results and implementation reports.

L.A. Mission is currently out of compliance with Title IX. They have a plan to add two
women’s sports over the next two years, but could remain out of compliance if men’s
basketball is added. The College relies on a joint use agreement to use a county park for a field facility, and should continue to explore optional arrangements.

The College provides clear and accurate degree attainment, transfer and career pathway information. There are many opportunities for students to attend events and workshops, as well as comprehensive online information and links to external sources.

The College has made good progress in offering student support services online, and will integrate some of them with the Canvas CMS implementation later this year. The Counseling department and other student support areas work closely with the DE Coordinator to ensure training and information regarding online support resources are available to online instructional faculty. This is a positive step towards one of the QFE objectives, improving collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services.

The College needs to disaggregate data when it moves to the state-wide assessment instrument to ensure lack of bias for sub-populations. This is critical based on the College discovery and acknowledgement that errors have been made in the past.

The Los Angeles Community College District meets the Standard. The District has adopted, and adheres to, admission policies that are consistent with its mission. These policies include criteria for special categories of students such as concurrent high school enrollment and F-1 students. These policies are published in District and college publications and websites. The District does not have a role in defining and/or advising on clear pathways to degree or certificate completion or transfer.

The District 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

**Recommendation 2 (Compliance):** In order to meet the Standards and as noted by the College in its Quality Focus Essay, the Team recommends that the College provide appropriate, reliable and equitable support services to all students. In addition, the Team recommends training staff to improve the design and assessment of service area outcomes to continuously improve student support programs and services. (I.B.4, II.C.1, II.C.2, II.C.3, II.C.5, ER 15)
Standard III.A: Human Resources

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.

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Human Resources Division, Board Rules, and the Personnel Commission guide hiring processes for the College. Human resource policies and practices meet accreditation standards. The College adheres to the Boards Policies and Procedures, LACCD HR Guide, and the Academic Senate faculty hiring procedures for faculty recruitment, ethical conduct, prohibiting harassment, and diversity and equity. Faculty members meet the minimum state requirement and administrators meet the academic service minimum qualifications and hiring requirements in accordance with Board rules and the LACCD HR Guide. Development and classification of classified job descriptions, recruitment, and testing for classified positions falls under the Personnel Commission’s purview. The Personnel Commission audit unit ensures adherence with all state, District, and Personnel Commission guidelines.

Staffing is a component of the integrated planning process. The number of full-time faculty hires for each college is calculated at the District which incorporates the full-time faculty obligation number (FON) as well as input from college presidents. The faculty hiring prioritization process occurs at the college level. The hiring of part-time faculty is handled by individual departments. New classified staff positions are requested through the Program Review process and reviewed in Budget and Planning for prioritization. The District determines the sufficient number of presidents and vice presidents, and the College determines the number of deans needed to support the institution’s mission and purpose. The District also regularly tracks demographic
information for all hires and provides each president with a report in an attempt to encourage equity and diversity.

All employees are regularly evaluated according to a process that is well-defined and documented. The LACCD Human Resource department oversees the evaluation process. Full-time faculty evaluations are scheduled and completed consistently. Staff and administrator evaluations are considerably behind schedule, and academic administrator evaluations do not meet the formal requirements to include SLO assessment as a required element of the evaluation. Participation in the Student Learning Outcomes assessment cycles is a formal requirement of full-time faculty evaluations.

The College’s Professional and Staff Development Committee as well as Eagle’s Nest provide professional development opportunities which support the mission and goals of the College. Additionally, the district has created various initiatives to expand professional development including: the Dean’s Academy, Project MATCH, the Faculty Development College, the Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy, the President’s Academy, and Board Development. The District is in the early stages of developing a similar initiative for a Classified Leadership Academy. Adjunct faculty members may attend new faculty orientations and also have access to all campus workshops and the Eagle’s Nest for professional growth opportunities.

Findings and Evidence

The College openly recruits and selects qualified faculty, staff, and administrators. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of faculty are stated in the job announcements which are routinely posted on the LACCD website. The Personnel Commission ensures minimum qualifications for classified staff. Faculty must meet minimum qualifications as determined by the state of California (CCC Chancellor’s Office). The faculty members on the hiring committee from the given discipline or subject area make the determination whether applicants meet the minimum qualifications. Determination of equivalency to the minimum qualifications follows the procedures in Board Rule 10305 and any relevant district personnel guide. The District Human Resources audit team checks minimum qualifications for both full- and part-time faculty. The Personnel Commission ensures minimum qualifications for classified staff. The College follows District and College procedures with regards to faculty recruitment, selection, and job descriptions. (III.A.1)
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)

At LAMC, faculty selection committees abide by the LACCD HR Guide and the District Academic Senate faculty hiring procedures. Hiring committees are composed of a minimum of: the department chair or designee, a faculty member from the discipline, an Academic Senate representative, an AFT representative, an administrator, and a compliance officer. The District requires all participants complete training in equal employment opportunity and affirmative action principles and provides training. The hiring-workshop session includes a comprehensive review of the process, goals, and objectives, and training in nondiscrimination and equal employment opportunity principles, development of position announcements, evaluation of applications for minimum qualifications, and interview techniques. (III.A.1)

Faculty job descriptions include duties and responsibilities, minimum qualifications, and desirable qualifications. Duties and qualifications include, but are not limited to, development and review of curriculum, assessment of learning, discipline expertise, teaching skills, and other characteristics the college determines to be desirable including a sensitivity to and understanding of the special populations the college serves. Distance Education expertise is advertised in the job announcements for particular positions under desired qualifications. (III.A.2, ER 14)

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)

The District HR audit unit and the District Personnel Commission audit unit for classified managers appraise minimum qualifications for administrators and staff. (III.A.3)

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)

Published job announcements and selection processes clearly state that required degrees must be from institutions accredited by US accrediting agencies or that equivalence to such degrees be established. Degrees from foreign universities must be accompanied by equivalency documents issued by a U.S. credential review service. Degrees from non-US institutions are evaluated based on the CHEA service for classified employees. (III.A.4)

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)

LAMC has comprehensive evaluations for the president which take place every three years as well as an annual evaluation. The evaluation process for deans, faculty, and classified personnel are developed in conjunction with their respective collective bargaining units. Deans are evaluated no later than 12 months after their start date and every year thereafter. Tenured faculty are evaluated every three years while part-time faculty receive a formal evaluation before the end of their second semester and at least once every six semesters. Classified personnel are evaluated on an annual basis by their immediate supervisors. The district uses a program called EASY to remind supervisors and staff of required evaluations. Despite Easy, the College identified a backlog of administrative performance reviews and includes a recommendation in the Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process. The College plans to work more closely with the Personnel Office to identify and close gaps in the performance evaluations. (III.A.5)

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 performance evaluations are outlined in the AFT, Local 1521 CBA, 2014-17 contract, and faculty are required to participate in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle. A
review of two anonymous full-time evaluation revealed that the faculty member checks a box that he/she met the expectation of participating in the outcomes assessment cycle; however, there was no evidence on how results were used to improve teaching and learning. Academic administrators, while overseeing the SLO Assessment Cycle through supervision of faculty, are not currently evaluated on using SLO results to increase effectiveness. (III.A.6)

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)

The College recognized through the fall 2014 Faculty and Staff Survey and the Self-Evaluation Report that there may not be enough qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the College. Since then, the College has made great strides toward hiring full-time faculty; 11 probationary faculty in 2014-2015 and another 11 for 2015-16. The College employs 86 full-time faculty and 282 adjunct faculty, a FON of 53.5%. The College, guided by the District, consistently moves closer to meeting its FON. In general, the College currently employs a sufficient number of full- and part-time faculty to achieve its mission. (III.A.7, ER 14)

Per the College Academic Senate hiring procedures, the department chairs and vice chairs, the College Academic Senate, the Educational Planning Committee, and the College President or designee may submit proposals for faculty positions to the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (FHPC). The FHPC reviews and prioritizes the positions (according to enrollment/growth patterns, sections offered, proportion of hours taught full-time v. adjunct) and forwards them to the Resource Analysis (Budget) Committee. The Budget Committee consults with the college president or designee and recommends to the College Council the number of faculty positions to be filled in a given year. Final approval rests with the President. The President or designee forwards an Intent to Fill form for each position to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. (III.A.7, ER 14)

Through policies, practices, and collective bargaining agreements, the College integrates part-time faculty into College life. All faculty professional development opportunities identified in III.A.14 are available to part-time faculty. (III.A.8)

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)

The College recognized through the Fall 2014 Faculty and Staff Survey a 2013 Staff Comparison that the College had less staffing than comparable colleges. The College has taken steps to close the gap. If a current classified staff position becomes vacant, it is filled. New classified staff positions are requested in the program review process. The VPs review the requests and discussion occurs at the Budget and Planning meetings, where an evaluation matrix is used to prioritize the positions based on the need and the amount of funding available. Since fall of
In 2014-15, the Transfer Center, Outreach and Recruitment, Financial Aid, EOP&S, and DSP&S completed a program review cycle where they identified gaps in service and staffing levels. A Student Services Action Plan was developed and resulted in hiring a dean of student success, an associate dean for DSP&S, a full-time counselor, an outreach coordinator, an Admissions and Records evaluation technician, two temporary counselors, an articulation officer, and a part-time athletic counselor. Student Services is currently reassessing its staffing needs and creating a 2016-17 Staffing Plan. Occasionally the Personnel Commission performs a “desk audit” to determine if the appropriate classification is assigned given the current job duties. (III.A.9, ER 8)

The District determines the number of presidents and VPs for the Colleges; one president and three vice presidents for LAMC. Through the staffing comparison study, the College determined that they had fewer deans and other staff than other comparable colleges. Five key administrative positions have been filled since April 2014, including two new deans of Academic Affairs, a dean of Student Success, and an associate dean of DSP&S. The College maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to support the College mission. (III.A.10, ER 8)

The District Human Resources Division provides leadership in establishing an equitable administration of rules and policies in accordance with Human Resource Guides, Personnel Guides, union contracts, Board Rules, and state Education Code. The District provides a link to all employee Collective Bargaining Agreements and personnel policies and procedures on its webpage. The District Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion ensures that policies are equitably administered. (III.A.11)

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 District maintains statistics on each college’s record of diversity. The District is responsible for recruitment of candidates and keeps a record of the characteristics of its applicant pool. The District and College are committed to recruiting from a diverse pool. In prior years, job announcements were only be advertised on the District website and the Registry. The VP of Academic Affairs has increased the advertising of recent positions to include the Chronicle, Higher Education Jobs websites, as well as Hispanic, Black and Asian Higher Education Publications which has increased the diversity of the applicant pool. The District Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion trains selection committees and has developed an Equal Opportunity Employment Plan. (III.A.12)
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 College upholds the District Academic Senate Policy on faculty ethics, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees. All other personnel are covered by District Board Rules. (III.A.13)

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 College has a multiple channels through which it provides professional development. The fall FLEX day tends to focus on administrative issues, the spring FLEX day focuses on pedagogy, and the college has been holding all-day summits on SLOs, PLOs, SAOs, and ILOs. The Professional and Staff Development Committee provides a schedule of workshops, book clubs, and professional development meetings which available each semester on their website, or the Eagle’s Nest. The spring 2016 workshop was entitled, “Achieving the Equity Dream.” Workshops are also help at the department level, for discipline-specific training. Counselors across the campus have monthly trainings. New faculty members at the College are required to attend the New Faculty Academy consisting of various Friday trainings throughout the year. During the tenure process, if deficiencies are identified in faculty members, faculty development training is made available. All workshops are open to all staff and faculty (including part-time faculty). After each workshop, a survey is distributed which asks participants if the training met their needs and to identify other training they would like to see in the future. As the College has recently made the decision to switch to Canvas as their learning management system, most training for distance education has focused on the migration from Etudes to Canvas. The Campus recently placed an IT employee under special assignment to aid faculty in the transition of learning management systems. The Professional Growth Committee has a commendable website where it outlines the process to apply for travel and conference funds or tuition reimbursement. (III.A.14)

In addition to the professional development provided by the College, the District provides workshops through the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), a 6-day Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy (FTLA), a 4-day Dean’s Academy, a President’s Academy, a Student’s Academy, and Board Development. They are currently planning the creation of a Classified Leadership Academy as well. The District Academic Senate has also made available professional development courses which result in a master teacher certificate. The Personnel Commission offers workshops to classified employees. (III.A.14)

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)

Provisions for the privacy and confidentiality, security, accuracy, and permanence of personnel files specifically addressed in union contracts override any similar provisions contained in the Personnel Guides. Collective bargaining agreements delineate the types of files kept and the rights of employees to view the contents. Employees can make appointments with District HR to view the contents of their personnel file. (III.A.15)

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)

Conclusion

The College meets all the Standards and Eligibility Requirements except for Standard III.A.6.

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.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College update academic administrators’ and part-time faculty performance evaluations to include the responsibility of learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. III.A.6
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)
Standard III.B: Physical Resources

General Observations

Los Angeles Mission College has seen growth and expansion in its campus and the community it serves. From humble beginnings in 1975, the college has grown to a 33-acre campus. In 1991, the new permanent campus was established on a 22-acre site in Sylmar, and in 2007 an additional 11-acre of land (east campus). Los Angeles Mission College not only serves the local community of Sylmar but also serves the communities surrounding them; such as Granada Hills, Lake View Terrace, Pacoima, Sepulveda, Sun Valley, Sunland, Tujunga, and Mission Hills. The institution works diligently to maintain a safe, secure, and well maintained environment at their various locations. There is long term planning to ensure the facilities are maintained and updated on a regular basis. The consideration of future growth expansion, and upkeep are a part of the institutions focus in regards to physical resources.

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

Findings and Evidence

The College provides a safe, secure, and well maintained facility at its various locations. Careful consideration and planning are a priority when it comes to ensuring the safety of students, faculty, staff, and the community. Adherence to federal, state, and local agency regulations such as air quality mandates, safety vessel requirements, operation and inspection of automatic devices, and storage of hazardous waste. All fire sprinklers and alarms meet National Fire Protection Association recommendations. L.A. Mission College provides a list of evidence as proof of meeting the standard which includes but is not limited to the following: Adherence to federal, state, and local agency regulations; observance of CAL OSHA; National Fire Protection Association recommendations; campus security; observance of the Clery Act; and yearly surveys to evaluate the safety and sufficiency of facilities. (Standard III.B.1)

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 College utilizes Program Review, annual unit plans, the Educational Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Facilities and Planning Committee, and a Five Year Construction Plan to ensure regularly updated and maintained facilities. To date, L.A. Mission College has used a $436 million bond to complete a Center for Math and Science, a Health and Fitness Center, and a parking facility. According to the report 75% of the projects from the Master Plan have been completed. The evidence for meeting this standard includes but is not limited to: Program Review website; Facilities Master Plan 2014; Educational Master Plan; Deferred Project Maintenance Plan; and the SMSR Five-Year Plan. (Standard III.B.2)

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 College uses several sources to evaluate the effectiveness of its facilities and equipment. The College adheres to all federal, state, and local code regulations while staying within the District’s budget allocations. The college allocates 61% of its space to classroom space and 20 % to support staff as outlined in the 2009 Master Plan. The evidence for meeting this Standard includes but is not limited to: Program Review, Facilities Planning Minutes, College Council Minutes, Annual Space Inventory Report, and FUSION. (Standard III.B.3)

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 College uses the Facilities Master Plan and the Educational Master Plan to guide long-range planning and to project the cost of future facilities and equipment. The increase of classroom size, student growth, parking laboratory facilities renovation, and office space are all taken into consideration. The evidence for meeting this Standard includes but is not limited to: The Facilities Master Plan (Updated in 2014) and the Educational Master Plan. (Standard III.B.4)

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)

Conclusion

The College meets this 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 District meets the Standard.

Recommendations

None
Standard III.C: Technology Resources

General Observations

As technology changes and the campus continues to grow the technology needs are continuously advancing. Technology needs span the entire campus. Students use technology for registration, completing coursework, and communicating with faculty and peers. Faculty needs in the technology area are also multitudinous; including various technologies to deliver instruction, communicate with students, and manage classroom staff. Classified and support staff also have technology needs that need to be met and/or addressed.

The institution works ardently to maintain technology services that support the faculty, staff, and students. Great care is taken to ensure that technology is adequate to support the College’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching, learning, and support services on their campus. The institution is aware of the need to plan for the update and/or replacement of technology to maintain a quality environment that supports its mission.

The College’s technology needs are supported by the Information Technology Services department (ITS) which is headed by the manager of the College Information Systems. Operations are governed by the Technology Master Plan and the Technology Replacement Plan. The ITS department monitors and supports 1200 computers, laptops, and portable devices.

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

The College provides technology services for students, faculty, staff, and the community. The services range from student registration and completing online course work, to staff assisting students online and communicating with peers, as well as, counselors assisting with registration and student communication. The College uses the Educational Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, and the Technology Master Plan to direct, priorities, and support the needs for infrastructure, equipment and software need for the institution.
There is one area in which the institution recognizes a need for improvement and has set a plan in place to address this area. The use of data collected from various surveys could be improved upon. By Spring 2016, the technology committee has plans to develop a process, using collected data, to better assess the technology-related needs of the College. The goal is to inform the revision of the Technology Master Plan (TMP) and the Technology Replacement Plan (TRP).

The evidence for meeting this standard includes but is not limited to: Technology Master Plan, Technology Replacement Plan, an Information Technology Service department which supports and maintains over 1200 computers, laptops, and portable devices, the most current software which helps to protect and maintain proper functioning of the devices, and a knowledgeable and professional ITS department. (Standard III.C.1)

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)

To ensure technology services are available to meet the needs of the College, including all campuses, the College plans for acquiring, upgrading, maintaining and/or replacing equipment in a systematic way. Careful consideration is taken when it comes to the cost of purchasing, maintaining, and or upgrading equipment. The college strives to stay within the budget allotted for this purpose but can rely on district funds if necessary. The Technology Committee oversees the needs of the campus in regards to technology, and individual departments can make requests during the annual Program Review. Using the annual Program Review, the Technology Committee prioritizes the needs of the campus. The evidence for meeting this Standard includes but is not limited to: Five-Year Technology Replacement Plan, the annual Program Review system, agreements with multiple vendors, regular updates to ETUDES, and the Computerized Maintenance Management System. (Standard III.C.2)

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)

The College assures the safe, reliable secure, and available use of technology on all campus sites through a variety technologies and models. There are two Data Centers. The Primary Data Center located on main campus, and a Secondary Data Center on the east campus. The evidence for meeting this standard includes but is not limited to: LDAP, Single Sign On, Federated ID, New SIS Web Portal, Student and Faculty Email Accounts, and Security Cameras Map. (Standard III.C.3)

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)

The College provides training opportunities to faculty and staff, as well as, support for operating various technologies and/or technology systems. There are several opportunities for training of faculty offered by the Professional Development Committee and the ITS department. Classified and support staff can also avail themselves of the Professional Development Committee and the ITS department trainings. Students also have various opportunities for training. The evidence for meeting this Standard includes but is not limited to: Distances Education Certificate, Microsoft IT Academy, faculty and staff surveys, and Self Orientation. (Standard III.C.4)

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)

Conclusion
The College meets this Standard. 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)

Recommendations

Recommendation 7 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends
that Los Angeles Mission College should follow through with its Actionable Improvement Plan
regarding the use of data collected from various surveys being improved upon. The plan is by
spring 2016, the technology committee has plans to develop a process, using collected data, to
better assess the technology-related needs of the College. The goal is to inform the revision of
the Technology Master Plan (TMP) and the Technology Replacement Plan (TRP). (Standards III.C.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)
Standard III.D: Financial Resources

General Observations

Los Angeles Mission College, in the aftermath of the 2008 recession, concentrated its resources on the maintenance and stability of instructional departments and student services to support student success. Throughout the crisis, the District and College remained fiscally solvent and managed to avoid furloughs or layoffs. In the recent years, with the influx of additional discretionary funding, LAMC’s Budget and Planning Committee has been permitted to consider resource requests for growth and innovative programs.

The College, in an effort to closely monitor its budget and develop strategies based on continued fiscal solvency, submits monthly budget projections to and holds quarterly meetings with the District CFO and staff. The College has demonstrated sound financial planning and performance by consistently meeting enrollment targets while remaining within its budgeted allocations. The College has been fiscally solvent with a positive ending fund balance for the past six years.

Resource requests link goals and planning directly to the College Mission. Connection to the College Mission is a component in measuring the strength of a resource request in a program review document. All resource requests are prioritized and vetted through a college participatory governance process. The College’s program review process guides financial planning and budget development, including the prioritization of resource requests. Institutional planning takes place through the shared governance process, including in College Council and through the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC), with all constituency groups having the opportunity to be represented. Annually, BPC disseminates the prioritized resource requests list to the entire campus to review before items are put to a vote at College Council.

The College and the District have clearly defined guidelines and processes for financial planning and development. Annually, the LACCD BOT establishes the budget calendar for the fiscal year. The College community has ample opportunities to participate in budget planning and development through the program review process. The District and College maintain sufficient cash flow and reserves in a fund to meet all current and reasonably anticipated future obligations.

The College relies on the District to provide resources for its general operations. Additionally, many departments have developed entrepreneurial opportunities and income streams to supplement their general fund budgets. If additional, unexpected funds become available during the year, program review and resource prioritization dictate the manner in which these resources are allocated.

The District annually has an independent audit performed to verify the accuracy of its financial statements and fiscal management practices, as well as the effectiveness of its internal controls. In response to audit findings, the College prepares a corrective action plan, and findings are generally remedied before the next audit cycle. The LACCD Internal Audit unit also performs audits of business practices cyclically.
Business functions are carried out under the supervision of the Vice President for Administrative Services (VPAS). Managers of externally funded programs meet with the business staff and administrators to ensure that financially sound and generally accepted accounting practices are routinely followed. Monthly and quarterly review of financial position and FTES objectives provide assurance that the College’s spending is on track and that the College’s operations align with District objectives. The evaluation of the College’s financial practices occurs during annual retreats, through assessment of Service Area Outcomes, the program review process, and through the District Internal Audit function.

The VPAS reviews all monthly projections before submitting them to the District CFO. The College Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) reviews monthly financial projections at its meetings. The College has augmented general fund instructional budgets by State Instructional and Library Materials and Lottery funds for Instructional Supplies.

The District Internal Audit Unit performs regular internal audits to assess its oversight of financial and information systems and uses those findings as the basis for improvements. The District evaluates its financial and internal control systems on a continuous cycle to ensure validity and effectiveness. Results from internal and external audits are used to improve processes. Where deficiencies are the result of issues with internal controls, policies, or procedures, remedial steps are taken and are reviewed during the next Internal Audit cycle.

Information from external District audits is provided to the Budget Finance Committee, District Budget Committee, Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee, Board of Trustees, and the CFO, and is used to evaluate and improve the District’s financial management and internal control systems. All audit reports are reviewed and progress toward implementation of corrective action plans for all audit findings are tracked by the CFO’s office on an ongoing basis. External auditors review progress of corrective actions taken annually. Bond programs and specially funded programs also undergo annual external audits to determine compliance with regulations and that sound financial practices are followed.

The District experienced more than $100 million in funding cuts between FY2009 and FY2013. Significant reductions were made in class offerings, employee benefit programs, and the District implemented stringent spending controls. By maintaining healthy reserves and instituting strict spending practices, the District was able to weather the recession without furloughing or laying off permanent employees. Strong fiscal controls, coupled with an improved state economy, have left the District in a financially healthy condition. District reserves for 2015-2016 are $41.48 million and represents 6.5% of the unrestricted general fund revenue budget. The District’s contingency reserve is $23.42 million and represents 3.5% of the unrestricted general fund revenue budget. The contingency reserve is used to meet emergency situations or budget adjustments due to funding projection shortfalls that may happen during a fiscal year.

The District manages oversight and management of all financial resources. It also continuously evaluates and improves its oversight of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contracts, foundations, etc. Oversight takes place at both the campuses and at the District Office. Those functions with centralized oversight include portions of Purchasing, investments and assets, budget oversight, financial aid, specialized employees, audits, and auxiliary organizations.
Decentralized functions with district oversight include fiscal and enrollment management, auxiliary organizations (college foundations), and associated student organizations. The District allocates resources using a formula driven approach that ensures an efficient and equitable distribution of resources. The management information system (SAP) provides tools and reports that facilitate effective control over finances. The College Business Office uses the system to monitor budget availability for requests before they are sent to the District, ensuring adequate funding is available.

The District maintains fiscal solvency by ensuring that all obligations are identified accurately. The District systematically identifies and evaluates its obligations on an annual basis and when needed, brings in third party actuaries to establish the amount of the obligations. The District adheres to reserve and fiscal management policies, congruent with the District’s Strategic plan, and endures financial solvency in the short- and long-term. The District creates comprehensive income and cost projections on a regular basis that are used for budget planning, resulting in a long-standing culture of fiscal responsibility and solvency.

Internal and external audits help to confirm that the District uses its financial resources for their intended purpose. The District has not received any modified audit opinions for its financial statements for over twenty years and has received unqualified opinions for bond performance and financial audits since the inception of its bond program. LA Mission College has had no audit findings since 2011. Internal audits resulted in some areas of weaknesses in purchasing, asset tagging, and cash controls, but corrective action plans have been implemented to address deficiencies.

The District’s annual OMB A-133 audit is used to determine compliance with major Federal programs such as Title IV. The College monitors and manages its funds as evidenced by no negative findings in the past three years’ external audits. The most current official three-year cohort default rate for the College is 16.4%.

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, EEUU Local 99, Building and Construction Trades, Supervisors Local 721, Classified Management, and Associated Students Organization. This committee also includes the deputy chancellor, chief financial officer, and budget director as resource personnel. The DBC reports to both the chancellor and all constituent groups, and is charged with formulating recommendations to the chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District’s Strategic Plan; reviewing the District’s budget; making recommendations to the chancellor for adoption or modifications; and reviewing the District’s financial condition on a quarterly basis.

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

Beginning in April 2016, a new vice chancellor of finance and resource development will begin tenure and will hire a new director, institutional advancement. The latter, new position will focus on resource and workforce development. There will be no significant changes to the responsibilities of current staff except for the addition of one reporting layer between the chief financial officer and chancellor.

Findings and Evidence
Los Angeles Mission College has balanced its budget and met its enrollment goals for the last two fiscal years. The District budget allocation model is based on enrollment and allocates funds for administration, maintenance and operations, and scheduled maintenance. The budget has been augmented in the last few years by an influx of additional discretionary funding which has been distributed based upon the LAMC program review and shared governance process. (III.D.1)

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)
The College's mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning. The initiation of the allocation process is the program review. All College departments must prepare an annual program review, in which they may request additional funding for technology, human resources, facilities, and/or equipment. The connection with the College Mission is a component in measuring the strength of a resource request in Program Review. LAMC prepares monthly and quarterly financial projections which are shared with the campus community. (III.D.2)

The Program Review process guides financial planning and budget development, including the prioritization of budget requests. The Budget and Planning Committee is the main campus shared governance committee that prioritizes additional requests for resources. BPC receives division level prioritized resource requests before prioritizing these requests in accordance with institutional priorities and the College Mission and goals. There is a clearly defined rubric for determining priority. The BPC distributes the prioritized lists to the entire campus for review before they are voted on by College Council. Everyone has an opportunity to participate in this process through their department's program review or by serving on shared governance committees. (III.D.3)

LACCD undergoes an external audit annually to verify the accuracy of its financial statements and fiscal management practices, as well as its internal controls. While the majority of funding comes from the District during the budget allocation process, LAMC has developed external sources of income such as facility rentals and external contracts. Further LAMC has other sources of externally funded revenue sources in the form of categorical funding from the State. Monthly projections and quarterly reviews of revenue and FTES objectives enable LAMC to evaluate and assess its progress in meeting its mission and goals within its allocated resources. (III.D.4)

LACCD has Board policy requiring the CFO to generate interim financial statements, including a review of revenue and expenditures, and submit said to the Chancellor monthly during the academic year. The Chancellor is required to report financial status to the Board of Trustees quarterly and to the Budget and Finance committee monthly. The District Budget Committee (DBC), Board Budget and Finance Committee (BFC), Board of Trustees, and the colleges receive financial information on a set schedule. Information on resource allocation, debt management, and financial management is routinely provided to the BFC and DBC so their committee members can be fully informed when making policy recommendations to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor.

The District performs regular internal audits to assess its oversight of financial and information systems and uses these findings as a basis for improving its practices. Most recently, the Internal Audit unit prepared a procurement on the colleges and Educational Service Center (ESC). LAMC's outcome indicated that its procurement practices needed improvement. The procurement process allows campuses to purchase items up to $5,000 generally. The time period reviewed was April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014. Findings included improper or lack of tagging of equipment; lack of date stamping of invoices to determine aging of payment; lack of timely Board reporting of contract purchase orders; unauthorized purchases; and untimely payments to vendors. Consequently procurement and accounts payable training was instituted.
across the District. Other internal audits performed at LAMC were a cash control audit, an ASO audit, and an audit of the Foundation. In each case, the College has responded by updating policies and procedures and instituting internal controls. (III.D.5)

Financial statements and projections are reviewed on a monthly basis by the Vice President of Administrative Services before they are submitted to the District CFO. The District allocates funding for administrative salaries and maintenance and operations, which are offset by the cost of the Sheriff contract. The District allocates funds based on FTES revenue, COLA, growth if any, and Proposition 30 revenue. Other revenue distributed by the District are non-resident tuition based on college projections of tuition earnings; local and other federal and state revenue based upon actual amount to be generated; and lottery revenue based on the proportion of the college’s prior year FTES over the total District FTES. Each college is further required to create a reserve up to 2% of general fund revenue. To support student learning, LAMC honors each unit’s prioritization of resource requests, recognizing that departments and divisions have the best information regarding the needs of their students. (III.D.6)

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)

LACCD undergoes an external financial audit annually. Where findings occur, the affected college prepares a corrective action plan outlining how it will, in the future, avoid the same behavior that caused the finding. The Internal Audit unit also performs audits on colleges and the ESC to ensure controls are in place to avoid instances of behavior or actions that would cause weaknesses in internal control. The college, if found out of compliance, must create a corrective action plan to remedy these compliance issues. The external audit is placed on the District’s website for wide dissemination to constituents. In the past three years, the LACCD Internal Audit unit has performed audits on LAMC procurement, asset management, and cash controls processes, as well as processes at the LAMC Foundation and the Associated Student Organizations. Due to these audits, LAMC has updated processes and procedures to ensure the College meets internal control standards. (III.D.7)

The District evaluates its financial and internal controls systems continuously to endure validity are discovered, policies, procedures, and/or remedial steps are taken before the next audit cycle.
In the last few years, LAMC has undergone four internal audits. The District Internal Audit unit has performed audits on accounts payable and asset management; cash controls; associated student body funds; and the LAMC Foundation. (III.D.8)

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.D.7) (III.D.10)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perkins Default Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Trade-Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West LA</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)

Annually the District undergoes an OMB A-133 audit to determine compliance with federal programs such as Title IV. The District received an unmodified opinion and was deemed compliant with all requirements stated in OMB Circular A-133. Further, the average three year Perkins default rate is 17.62%. (III.D.15)

Contractual agreements are reviewed and approved by the VPAS to ensure they are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution; are governed by institutional policies; and contain
appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of its programs, services, and operations. (III.D.16)

Conclusion
The College meets this Standard. The district 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.

Recommendations

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

Standard IV.A: Decision Making Roles and Processes

General Observations
The College has engaged the College community in developing inclusive methodology to improve the decision-making and processes. The shared governance committees have developed logical structure and clear purpose statements in order to support the decision-making process. The College has identified integrated planning as a goal of its Quality Focus Essay in order to systemize its planning process. The College has delineated authority and the respected responsibility for faculty, staff and administrative employees of the college. Evidence indicates that the President has the authority to run the College.

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

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

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

Findings and Evidence
The College has developed documentation, structures, and processes to incorporate input from the faculty, staff, students, administrators, and the represented constituencies in the decision making processes. The evidence points to effective collection of data, formally documenting the improvements, communication of decisions and training, and closing the loop regarding the assessment of effect of solutions upon implementation (IV.A.1).
The District has a culture that encourages participation by all constituencies, described by the chancellor as “The Power of NINE!” in reference to the District’s nine colleges. Constituent participation includes the District- and college-level Academic Senate, the six collective bargaining units, the Associated Students, a seven-member Board of Trustees, and District/college management. These constituent bodies have the opportunity to provide input into decision-making as outlined in the District Governance and Functions Handbook. The governance functional map outlines the lines of authority and delineates the colleges and District roles. The District Governance and Functions Handbook describes the overall governance and decision-making structures for the colleges and the District (IV.A).

The College has developed processes to incorporate the input from the constituency groups into the College Council recommendations to the President. The composition of each constituency group, its authority, and involvement in the shared governance process is entailed in the College Handbook. Subcommittees of the College Council have developed models, rubrics, and assessment instruments in order to evaluate projects, requests for resources, viability of programs, and communicating respective recommendations to the President and the College. Respective shared governance and college council committees have clearly identified the scope of their authority, responsibility, and involvement in the institutional governance (IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.4).

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.)

The LACCD Board of Trustees recognizes the Academic Senate as a representative of faculty in discharge of the related authority and responsibility provided through the shared governance process. Reporting to the College Council, the College has established several relevant shared governance committees for inclusion of relative perspectives in the governance of the College (IV.A.5).
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)

The College administration and Academic Senate have developed a Shared Governance Handbook that is routinely updated. Evidence indicated that training is conducted for the constituency groups, which are also video recorded and archived for delayed review. The College President and Leadership team seem to interact with the employees and the student body via town hall meetings, static communication, and campus newsletter (Weekly Mission). However, evidence for assessing the effectiveness of the communication and the communication methodologies was not presented. The SGOC evaluates its process through a qualitative evaluation approach (IV.A.7.1-2) and communicates the results to the college constituency for review and as foundational data for improving processes (IV.A.6; IV.A.7).
Conclusion

The interviews conducted with the faculty, staff, and administrators confirmed the material the College had submitted as evidence in its self-evaluation document. Adhering to the ethos of the shared governance, the College has developed standards and processes in meeting its student success mission.

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

The College and District meet this standard.

Recommendations

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)
Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer

General Observations
The President joined the College five years ago at the onset of the resource reduction period in California Community College system. He has stabilized the institution through selecting permanent administrators, updating and implementing programs, completing construction projects, and representing the college in the community. The College has successfully applied for grants that improve the teaching and learning conditions for the faculty and students.

Findings and Evidence
Reporting to the LACCD Chancellor, the college president is the chief executive officer and exercises final authority on instructional programs, budget, program development personnel hires, facilities development, and other aspects of the college’s operations. In accordance to the shared governance process, the President has established committees and procedures to incorporate the advice and recommendations of the constituency groups in the governance of the College. Evidence indicates a great deal of interaction between the president and the student body, the faculty, staff and administrators. Weekly communication briefs and monthly hour-long town hall meetings that are recorded for delayed review facilitate exchange of information (IV.B.1).

The College is administered through three divisions of academic, administrative, and student services affairs, each staffed by a respective vice president and respective directors, faculty, managers, and staff. A 2014 survey indicates that the majority of faculty and staff believe the college is staffed accordingly relevant to its size. The President provides regular feedback to his direct reports to encourage and improve performance. Scope of authority and the related responsibilities have been delineated. The District distributes resources to the colleges within the system based on a prescribed Resource Allocation Formula, and the Colleges are responsible for developing and maintaining budgets to deliver education and training to the students within their service area (IV.B.2).

The President leads the efforts of shared governance groups in developing a collegial process based on mutual respect and inclusion of all constituents’ viewpoints. The College has developed and assesses performance standards for student achievement. Methodical and data-driven processes that are supported by the college’s Institutional Effectiveness department incorporates external and internal influences on decisions. The College contracted the services of a consulting firm to help with the development of a planning process. The multi-year educational master plan is reviewed annually through a strategic master plan process in order to gage the progress of projects. An integrated model relates planning to resource allocation for assignment of funds to human resources, goods, and services (IV.B.3).

The President is involved in the accreditation efforts of the college as the leading member of the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC). ASC, which meets on a weekly basis, included members of the college constituencies as support, and a number of key faculty, staff and administrators who actively participated in data collection and analysis and the composing of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER). The President held town hall meetings to apprise the college community of the accreditation self-evaluation progress. The President facilitated
updating of administrative procedures and campus processes based on information gleaned from dialogue and data analysis in the ASC meetings (IV.B.4).

The President serves as a conduit between the LACCD and Mission College for the exchange of information, reports, and representation. He seeks Budget and Planning Committee’s input regarding the college’s budgets and relates the information at the District Budget Committee in order to secure resources. He meets quarterly with the District CFO and the College’s Vice President of Administrative Services in order to monitor the College’s revenues and expenditures. He ensures the effective control of budgets and expenditures by leading the staff efforts in responding to audit findings (IV.B.5).

The President represents the College in a number of community and regional consortia, committees, boards, and forums in order to facilitate the exchange of information regarding the College’s services and inquiring about the needs of the communities. He is effectively involved in the College’s Foundation activities and the related service organizations in the community (IV.B.6).

Conclusion

The evidence indicates that the President has developed a high degree of trust among the faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The ease of communication and collaboration was readily observed by the team members. The President has been selected for the Man of the Year award by the Rotary organization for his and the College’s involvement in the community.

The College meets this Standard.

Recommendations

None
**Standard IV.C: Governing Board**

**General Observations**

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

**Findings and Evidence**

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

Conclusion

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)
Standard IV.D: 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
Feedback/Advice

The Quality Focus Essay identified areas that the College needs improvement on based on the Self Evaluation. During the Self Evaluation process it became clear that the College had developed a variety of necessary planning documents that included the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, Technology Master Plan, Technology Replacement Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Student Services Master Plan, Distance Education Plan, Student Success and Support Program Plan, Student Equity Plan, as well as the Strategic Master Plan. The result of having so many individual plans developed by separate committees has resulted in duplication of efforts, lack of efficiency, and the potential for committees to work at cross purposes at times.

The College has developed Action Plan One to integrate all these planning efforts to maximize College resources, improve efficiency, and better enable the College to fulfill its Mission. The action plan includes establishing an Integrating Planning Committee (IPC) that will oversee the realignment of college planning. The IPC will work on merging key elements of the existing plans together to develop a more focused College Strategic Master Plan which may combine the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, Technology Mater Plan, Technology Replacement Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Student Services Master Plan, and the Distance Education Plan. The College is encouraged to move in this direction to better utilize resources and avoid duplication of efforts. This initiative will provide for better integration of planning activities and streamline the entire planning process.

Action Project Two is focused on Transforming Student Services to Achieve Student Success. The Student Services area had 5 recommendations from the 2013 ACCJC external evaluation visiting team. Among those recommendations was that the College needed to ensure that all student support service programs went through a Program Review process that included an outcomes assessment process. One of the recommendations in this current external team report “In order to meet the standards and as noted by the College in its Quality Focus Essay, the Team recommends that the College provide appropriate, reliable and equitable support services to all students. In addition, the Team recommends training staff to improve the design and assessment of service area outcomes to continuously improve student support programs and services.” In addition, the increased funding to the student service areas by the state requires accountability that would be captured in Program Reviews and assessment of outcomes as proposed by Action Project Two.

The College recently hired a Vice President of Student Services that is well qualified to lead Project Two. The timeline and processes laid out in the plan, although well thought out, would benefit from establishing measurable goals at the outset. What specific measures of improvement would the College like to accomplish over the seven year period? What are the desired outcomes that the college is trying to meet? This plan would be strengthened by identifying targets and then developing strategic initiatives to meet their goals.