IV.D. . MULTI-COLLEGE DISTRICTS OR SYSTEMS

IV.D.1

In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system CEO provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. Working with the colleges, the district/system CEO establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system.

The Chancellor engages employees from all nine colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) to work together towards educational excellence and integrity. Through his leadership and communication, the Chancellor has helped establish clear roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the District that support the effective operation of the colleges.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

CEO Leadership

a. The Chancellor demonstrates leadership in setting and communicating expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his participation in various faculty, staff, and student events at the nine colleges and the Educational Services Center. He shares his expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his columns in two District quarterly newsletters: Synergy and Accreditation 2016. Both newsletters are disseminated to District employees through email, posted on the District's website and distributed at campus and District meetings. The Chancellor's newsletter columns focus on his vision and expectations for educational excellence and integrity, support for effective college operations, and his expectation for all employees to engage in and support District and college accreditation activities (IV.D.1-1), (IV.D.1-2).

b. The Chancellor exhibits leadership at his regular monthly meetings with both the Chancellor's Cabinet (senior District administrators and college presidents), as well as the Presidents' Council, where he communicates his expectations, reviews and discusses roles, authority, and responsibility between colleges and the District, and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. In general, Cabinet meetings address operational effectiveness and alignment between the District office and the colleges, while the Presidents' Council focuses on overall District policy and direction and specific college needs and support (IV.D.1-3), (IV.D.1-4).

c. The Chancellor conducts regular retreats with the Cabinet to facilitate collaboration, foster leadership, and instill team building and mutual support. These retreats also provide the Chancellor with a forum to clearly communicate his expectations of educational excellence and integrity with his executive staff and college presidents (IV.D.1-5).

d. The Chancellor communicates his expectations of educational excellence and integrity during the selection and evaluation process for college presidents. The Chancellor holds presidents to clearly articulated standards for student success, educational excellence, and financial sustainability. He emphasizes educational excellence and integrity in their annual evaluations, goal-setting for the upcoming year, and review of their self-evaluations (see Standard IV.D.4). The Chancellor assures support for effective operation of the colleges when meeting individually with each college president on a regular basis

to discuss progress on their annual goals and any concerns, needs, and opportunities for their individual campus (IV.D.1-6).

e. The Chancellor communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity with faculty through regular consultation with the 10-member Executive Committee of the District Academic Senate (DAS). Meetings address academic and professional matters, including policy development, student preparation and success, District and college governance structures, and faculty professional development activities. The Chancellor also addresses educational excellence, integrity and support for college operations with faculty, staff and administrators through consistent attendance at Academic Senate's annual summits (IV.D.1-7), (IV.D.1-8), (IV.D.1-9).

f. The Chancellor assures support for the effective operation of the colleges through his annual Budget Recommendations to the District Budget Committee and the Board of Trustees. His most recent actions ensured the distribution of $57.67M from the State Mandate Reimbursement Fund and alignment of expenditures with the District's Strategic Plan goals (IV.D.1-10),(IV.D.1-11).

g. In instances of presidential vacancies, the Chancellor meets with college faculty and staff leadership to discuss interim president options. Most recently, he met with West Los Angeles College leadership and accepted their recommendation for interim president, prioritizing college stability and support for effective operations in his decision-making process (IV.D.1-12).

Clear Roles, Authority and Responsibility

h. The Los Angeles Community College District participated in the ACCJC's multi- college pilot program in 1999, and has continuously worked since that time to ensure compliance with this standard. In 2009, ACCJC visiting teams agreed that the District made great strides in developing a functional map that delineates college and district roles, and encouraged it to further "*...develop and implement methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district [as well as] widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those results as the basis for improvement.*" In response, the District renewed its dedication to, and focuses on, these activities (IV.D.1-13).

i. In October 2008, the Board of Trustees approved the first District/college Functional Area maps, which clarified the structure of District administrative offices and their relationship to the colleges, aligned District administrative functions with accreditation standards, and specified outcome measures appropriate to each function identified (IV.D.1-14).

j. In March 2010, the Board of Trustees approved an initial Governance and Functions Handbook, which expanded upon the previous District/College Functional Area maps to more clearly define District and college responsibilities and authority along accreditation standards. This was the culmination of a two-year project led by the District Planning Committee (DPC), which engaged faculty, staff, administrators and student leaders in this update. During this process, all administrative units in the Educational Service Center (ESC) updated their earlier functional descriptions and outcomes. Over 50 District-wide committee and council descriptions were also updated to a uniform standard. Functional Area maps were expanded to clarify policy formulation processes, roles and responsibilities of stakeholder groups, and the handbook evaluation process was defined (IV.D.1-15), (IV.D.1-16), (IV.D.1-17).

k. In 2013, the 2010 Governance Handbook underwent an internal review by the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division to ensure it matched current processes, organizational charts, and personnel. As of August 2015, the Handbook is being updated under the guidance of the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the EPIE division (IV.D.1-18).

l. In fall 2014, all ESC administrative units began a new Program Review process. Each of the eight administrative divisions developed unit plans and updated their unit descriptions and functional maps. Individual unit plans, along with measurable Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), replaced the previous District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) performance objectives (see Standard IV.D.2). Existing Functional Area maps were also reviewed and updated by the ESC administrative units. The content for District and college responsibilities is currently being reviewed by the colleges, the Executive Administrative Councils and other stakeholders (see Standard IV.D.2), (IV.D.1-19), (IV.D.1-20).

m. With the endorsement of the Chancellor and support from the District's Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) began reviewing and updating the District Governance and Functions Handbook in June 2014. With DPAC's leadership, the handbook will be reviewed and approved by representatives from the nine colleges and the ESC and submitted to the Board of Trustees for review and approval during the fall 2015 semester (IV.D.1-21).

n. In late 2009, the District began planning for a new Student Information System (SIS), currently scheduled to go live in fall 2017. During the initial phase, faculty, staff, and students mapped over 275 business processes, in which the functions, roles, responsibilities and the division of labor between colleges and the ESC were clarified, and in some instances, redefined. Business processes continue to be updated and refined as the SIS project moves through its various implementation phases (IV.D.1-22).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Chancellor communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity and support for effective college operations through regular meetings, electronic communications, college activities and faculty events across the District, and civic engagement throughout the region to bolster the goals and mission of the District.

The Chancellor and his executive team led the ESC's revised Program Review processes, which resulted in updated Functional Area maps, clarification of District and the colleges' roles and responsibilities, and identification of service gaps between college and District functions.

Update of the District's Governance and Functions Handbook as part of the District's regular review and planning cycle, will further strengthen its usefulness in providing clear roles, responsibilities, and authority for employees and stakeholders across the District. The District meets this Standard.

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

IV.D.1-1   Synergy Newsletters – 2014 through 2015
IV.D.1-2   District Accreditation Newsletters – 2014 through 2015
IV.D.1-3   Chancellor's Cabinet Agendas
IV.D.1-4   Presidents Council Agendas
IV.D.1-5   Chancellor Retreat Agendas – 2014
IV.D.1-6   WLAC College President Job Description – 2015
IV.D.1-7   Agendas from DAS Consultation Meetings with Chancellor – 2014 through 2015
IV.D.1-8   Agendas from DAS Summits – 2007 through 2015
IV.D.1-9   DAS Academically Speaking Newsletter – Fall 2015
IV.D.1-10   DBC Minutes – 8/13/2014 and 7/15/2015
IV.D.1-11   Chancellor Budget Recommendations – 8/26/2015
IV.D.1-12   WLAC Interim President Press Release – 6/25/15
IV.D.1-13   ELAC Accreditation Evaluation Report, 3/23-26/2009, pages 6-7
IV.D.1-14   District/College Functional Map – 2008
IV.D.1-15   LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook – 2010
IV.D.1-16   Committee Description Template
IV.D.1-17   College Governance and Functions Handbook Template
IV.D.1-18   LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook 2013
IV.D.1-19   ESC 2014 Program Reviews
IV.D.1-20   Functional Area Maps 2015
IV.D.1-21   LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook 2015
IV.D.1-22   SIS Maps

IV.D.2

The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.

During the District's early years, operations of the District Office (now known as the Educational Services Center) were highly centralized, and many college decisions related to finance and budget, capital projects, hiring, payroll and contracts were made "downtown." Operations were subsequently decentralized and functions delineated, and the District continues to evaluate these delineations on an ongoing basis.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:
a. In 1998, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of partial administrative decentralization. Colleges were given autonomy and authority for local decision-making to streamline

administrative processes, encourage innovation, and hold college decision-makers more accountable to the local communities they serve. Since that time, the District has continued to review and evaluate the delineation of responsibilities between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (IV.D.2-1).

Delineation of Responsibilities and Functions

b. Functional Area maps detail the division of responsibilities and functions between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC), as well as District-wide decision-making and planning (see Standard IV.D.1). The District developed its first functional maps in 2008, and they have been widely communicated and regularly updated since that time. In fall 2014, the Chancellor directed all ESC units to review and update their Functional Area maps to accurately reflect current processes, roles, and responsibilities as part of a comprehensive Program Review process (see Standard IV.D.1). Revised maps are currently under review by all colleges, the Executive Administrative Councils, and major stakeholders across the District. The Chancellor engages the college presidents and the cabinet in the discussion and review of the Functional Area maps. The Functional Area maps will be finalized in fall 2015 (IV.D.2-2), (IV.D.2-3).

Effective and Adequate District Services

c. The Chancellor directs the Educational Services Center staff to ensure the delivery of effective and adequate District services to support the colleges' missions. Services are organized into the following units: (1) Office of the Deputy Chancellor; (2) Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness; (3) Economic and Workforce Development; (4) Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer; (5) Facilities Planning and Development; (6) Human Resources; (7) Office of the General Counsel; and (8) the Personnel Commission (IV.D.2-4).

    • The Office of the Deputy Chancellor includes ADA training and compliance; Business Services, including operations, contracts, procurement and purchasing; Information Technology, including the District data center, system-wide applications, hardware and security, and Diversity Programs, which includes compliance and reporting.

    • Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) coordinates District-level strategic planning, accreditation, research, and attendance accounting reporting, as well as District-wide educational and student services initiatives, maintains course and program databases, and supports the Student Trustee and the Students Affairs Committees.

    • Economic and Workforce Development facilitates development of career technical education programs, works with regional businesses to identify training opportunities, collaborates with public and private agencies to secure funding, and keeps colleges informed of state and national issues affecting CTE programs.

    • Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer serves as the financial advisor to the Board and the Chancellor. Budget Management and Analysis develops revenue projections, manages funding and allocations, and ensures college compliance and reporting. The Accounting Office is responsible for District accounting, fiscal reporting, accounts payable, payroll, and student financial aid administration. Internal Audit oversees internal controls and manages the LACCD Whistleblower hotline.

    • Facilities Planning and Development is responsible for the long-term planning, management, and oversight of capital improvement and bond projects, as well as for

working collaboratively with college administrators to identify creative, cost-effective solutions to facility challenges.

- Human Resources assists colleges with the recruitment and hiring of academic personnel, the hiring of classified staff, and managing employee performance and discipline. It also conducts collective bargaining, develops HR guides, administers the Wellness Program, and oversees staff development.

- The Office of the General Counsel provides legal services to the Board of Trustees and District employees, including: litigation, contracting, Conflict of Interest filings, and Board Rule and administrative regulations review. It also responds to Public Records Act requests.

- The Personnel Commission is responsible for establishing and maintaining a job and salary classification plan for the classified service; administering examinations and establishing eligibility lists, and conducting appeal hearings on administrative actions, including demotions, suspensions, and dismissals.

Evaluation of District Services

d. Beginning in 2008, each ESC service area unit evaluated its own District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) as part of unit planning. In fall 2014, the Chancellor directed the Educational Services Center to implement a comprehensive Program Review to expand DOSOs into a data-driven evaluation process in support of the colleges (IV.D.2-5), (IV.D.2-6).

e. Each unit participated in a series of workshops on conducting a Program Review, led by an external consultant. Units identified and documented their core services, then created projected outcomes. Resulting Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) were based on District-wide needs and priorities, with clear links to district-level goals. The Program Review process requires each unit to consider its main contributions to the colleges' missions, goals, effectiveness, and/or student achievement or learning. Simultaneously, the ESC moved towards adopting an online Program Review system, currently in use at two of the District's colleges (IV.D.2-7), (IV.D.2-8), (IV.D.2-9).

f. An Educational Services Center user survey was created to solicit college user feedback in support of the Program Review process. Common questions were developed for all units, with individual units having the ability to customize supplemental questions specific to their college users. Over 21 user groups, including services managers, deans, directors, vice presidents, and presidents participated in the survey over a period of five weeks (IV.D.2-10).

g. As of this writing, all ESC divisions have completed one cycle of Program Review. Analysis of the ESC Services Survey was disaggregated and used to identify areas of strength and weakness. Units received feedback on the effectiveness of their services and suggestions for improvement. Results also included comparison data between different units within the ESC in order to provide a baseline for overall effectiveness. Units with identified areas for improvement set in place plans to remediate their services and strengthen support to the colleges in achieving their missions. The Board received a presentation on the status of the ESC Program Review process in spring 2015. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has since developed a Program Review manual for the ongoing implementation of Program Review at the ESC (IV.D.2-11), (IV.D.2-12), (IV.D.2-13).

Allocation of Resources

h. The District revised its Budget Allocation policies in June 2012 and its Financial Accountability policies in October 2013. Together, these policies set standards for support of college educational mission and goals, providing a framework for them to meet the requirements of Standard III.D. Policies hold colleges accountable for meeting fiscal stability standards, while also allowing a framework within which colleges can request additional financial support in instances of situational deficits. There is a clear process whereby colleges can request debt deferment or additional funds, and self-assessments and detailed recovery plans are required before receiving approval of such resources. The District and Board continue to evaluate these policies (see Standard III.D.3) and revise them as needed to support college fiscal stability (IV.D.2-14 though IV.D.2-17).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The District is comprised of nine individual colleges of vastly different sizes, needs and student populations. The Educational Services Center strives to continuously delineate its functions and operational responsibilities to support colleges in achieving their missions. Adequacy and effectiveness of District services are evaluated through Program Review and user satisfaction surveys. Through the implementation of its comprehensive Program Review process, the EPIE division discovered that its user surveys did not adequately evaluate the District and colleges' adherence to their specified roles and functions. In response, questions related specifically to this issue will be included in the 2016-2017 cycle of the District-wide governance and decision-making survey. Revisions to the Program Review system and assignment of specific staff will ensure ongoing evaluations are systematized and data driven, and that the results are used for integrated planning and the improvement of ESC services.

The District continues to evaluate its resource allocation and financial accountability policies to ensure colleges receive adequate support and are able to meet accreditation standards related to financial resources and stability. The District meets this Standard.

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE
IV.D.2-1   BOT Agenda, BT7 Decentralization Policy – 5/4/1998
IV.D.2-2   District Functional Area Maps 2015
IV.D.2-3   Functional Area Map Review Request Email – 7/24/2015
IV.D.2-4   2013 LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, pages 51-57
IV.D.2-5   DOSO Evaluations 2008-2009
IV.D.2-6   DOSO Evaluations 2011-2012
IV.D.2-7   Fall 2014 Accreditation Newsletter, "*ESC Begins Revitalized Program Review Cycle*"
IV.D.2-8   Program Review Workshop Agendas – 2014
IV.D.2-9   Program Review Template – 10/1/2015
IV.D.2-10   2014 ESC Services Surveys
IV.D.2-11   2014 ESC Services Survey Analyses

IV.D.2-12   Program Review Update PowerPoint – 2/20/2015
IV.D.2-13   Draft ESC Program Review Manual – 10/1/2015
IV.D.2-14   Budget Allocation Mechanism amendment – 6/3/2015
IV.D.2-15   Financial Accountability Measures – 10/9/2013
IV.D.2-16   ECDBC Recommendation on LAHC Deferral Request – 6/10/2015
IV.D.2-17   LAHC Debt Referral Request PowerPoint to BFC – 9/16/2015

IV.D.3

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

The District has well-established resource allocation policies that support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and District. These policies are regularly evaluated. Under the leadership of the Chancellor, college presidents, administrators and faculty leaders work together to ensure effective control of expenditures and the financial sustainability of the colleges and District.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Allocation and Reallocation of Resources
a. The District Budget Committee (DBC) provides leadership on District-level budget policies. Membership includes all nine college presidents, the District Academic Senate, and collective bargaining unit representatives. Its charge is to: (1) formulate recommendations to the Chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District Strategic Plan; (2) review the District budget and make recommendations to the Chancellor, and (3) review quarterly District financial conditions (IV.D.3-1).
b. In 2007, the District instituted a budget allocation policy which paralleled the SB 361 State budget formula. Funds are distributed to the colleges on a credit and noncredit FTES basis, with an assessment to pay for centralized accounts, District services, and set-aside for contingency reserves. In an attempt at parity, district-wide assessments were changed from a percentage of college revenue, to a cost per FTES basis, and the small colleges (Harbor, Mission, Southwest and West) received a differential to offset their proportionately-higher operational expenses (IV.D.3-2).
c. In 2008, the Fiscal Policy and Review Committee (FPRC) was created to address ongoing college budget difficulties and to consider new approaches for improving their fiscal stability. The FPRC and the DBC reviewed their roles and, in spring 2011, the FPRC was renamed the Executive Committee of the DBC (ECDBC). The charges for both committees were revised to ensure that budget planning policies were consistent with the District Strategic Plan (IV.D.3-3).
d. Also in 2011, the District undertook a full review of its budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayment. A review of other multi-college district budget models and policies was also conducted. The resulting recommendations were to adopt a model with a minimum base funding. The model had two phases:

- Phase I increased colleges' basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs (IV.D.3-4).

- Phase II called for further study in the areas of identifying college needs (including M&O), providing funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, and ensuring colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services (IV.D.3-4).

e. The Board of Trustees adopted an updated Budget Allocation policy on June 13, 2012. An evaluation of the policy was completed in late 2014, and additional policy recommendations were forwarded (IV.D.3-5),(IV.D.3-6).

f. The Board adopted new District Financial Accountability policies on October 9, 2013 to ensure colleges operate efficiently. These policies called for early identification and resolution of operating deficits required each college to set aside a one percent reserve, and tied college presidents' performance and evaluation to college budgeting and spending (IV.D.3-7).

g. The District's adherence to the state-recommended minimum 5% reserve has ensured its continued fiscal sustainability. In June 2012, the Board's Finance and Audit Committee (now known as the Budget and Finance Committee) directed the CFO to set aside a 5% general reserve and an additional 5% contingency reserve to ensure ongoing District and college operational support (IV.D.3-8).

Effective Control Mechanisms

h. The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditures. Each month, enrollment updates and college monthly projections are reported (see Standard IV.D.1). The Chancellor and college presidents work together in effectively managing cash flow, income and expenditures responsibly to maintain fiscal stability (IV.D.3-9).

i. College and District financial status is routinely reported to and reviewed by the Board of Trustees, along with college quarterly financial status reports, attendance accounting reports, and internal audit reports (see Standard III.D.5).

j. The District provides comprehensive budget and financial oversight, including an annual finance and budget report (CCFS-311), a final budget, an annual financial audit, a bond financial audit report, a performance audit of bond construction programs, year-end balance and open order reports, full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) reports and targets, enrollment projections, and year-to-year comparisons with enrollment targets (see Standard III.D.5).

k. Each college president is responsible for the management of his or her college's budget and ensures appropriate processes for budget development and effective utilization of financial resources in support of his/her college's mission (see Standard IV.D.2), (IV.D.3-7).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The District has a long history of financial solvency. Colleges follow standards of good practice that include the development of an annual financial plan, quarterly status reports, set-aside for reserves, and the obligation to maintain a balanced budget. Through its effective control of expenditures, the District has consistently ended the fiscal year with a positive balance. The higher levels of reserves have allowed the District to minimize the impact of cuts to college operations resulting from the State's recent financial crisis. The District meets this Standard.

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

IV.D.3-1   DBC web page Screenshot – 8/2015
IV.D.3-2   BOT Agenda, BF2, 2/7/2007 SB 361 Budget Allocation Model
IV.D.3-3   DBC Minutes – 5/18/2011
IV.D.3-4   ECDBC Budget Allocation Model Recommendation – 1/2012
IV.D.3-5   BOT Agenda, BF4, Budget Allocation Model Amendment – 6/13/2012
IV.D.3-6   District Budget Allocation Evaluation
IV.D.3-7   BOT Agenda, BF4, Financial Accountability Measures – 10/9/2013
IV.D.3-8   FAC Minutes – 6/13/2012
IV.D.3-9   2014-2015 Quarterly Projections

IV.D.4

The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO's accountable for the operation of the colleges.

The Chancellor delegates full responsibility and authority to the college presidents and supports them in implementing District policies at their respective colleges. College presidents are held accountable for their college's performance by the Chancellor, the Board, and the communities they serve.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. College presidents have full responsibility and authority to conduct their work without interference from the Chancellor (see Standard IV.C.3). College presidents have full authority in the selection and evaluation of their staff and management team (IV.D.4-1).

b. The framework for CEO accountability is established through annual goal-setting between the Chancellor and each college president. College presidents then complete a yearly self-evaluation based on their established goals. At least every three years (or sooner if requested), presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation, which includes an evaluation committee, peer input, and, if needed, recommendations for improvement. Unsatisfactory evaluations may result in suspension, reassignment, or dismissal. Evaluations are reviewed with the Board of Trustees in closed session (IV.D.4-2), (IV.D.4-3).

c. In October 2013, the Board adopted fiscal accountability measures which explicitly hold college presidents responsible to the Chancellor for their budgets, ensuring that they maintain "*a balanced budget, as well as the efficient and effective utilization of financial resources.*" These measures also require that the Chancellor "*…review the college's fiscal affairs and enrollment management practices as part of the college president's annual performance evaluation…[and] report to the Board of Trustees any significant deficiencies and take corrective measures to resolve the deficiencies up to and including the possible reassignment or non-renewal of the college president's contract.*" (IV.D.4-4).

d. The role of the Chancellor, as well as that of the presidents and the levels of authority within, is clearly delineated in the LACCD Functional Area maps, which explicitly state "*…the Chancellor bears responsibility and is fully accountable for all operations, programs, and services provided in the name of the district…The Chancellor delegates appropriate authority to the college presidents and holds them accountable for the operations and programs offered at District colleges.*" Functional Area maps are

regularly reviewed and updated, and published in the Governance and Functions Handbook and on the District website (IV.D.4-5).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The Chancellor delegates full authority and responsibility to the college presidents to implement District policies without interference. College presidents serve as the chief executives and educational leaders of their respective colleges. They ensure the quality and integrity of programs and services, accreditation status, and fiscal sustainability of their colleges. The District meets this Standard.

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE
IV.D.4-1   HR Guide R-110 Academic Administrator Selection – 7/31/2015
IV.D.4-2   College president Self Evaluation Packet
IV.D.4-3   BOT agendas w/President Evaluations
IV.D.4-4   BOT Agenda BF2 – 10/9/2013
IV.D.4-5   Chancellor Functional Area Map 2015

IV.D.5

District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.

College strategic plans are integrated with the District Strategic Plan (DSP), Vision 2017, through alignment of goals between the two. Colleges develop goals for their strategic and educational master plans during their internal planning process, and reconcile alignment with the District Strategic Plan on an annual basis. The structure of the DSP allows colleges to maintain autonomy and responsibility for implementing the goals and objectives of the District plan, based on their local conditions and institutional priorities (IV.D.5-1).

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

District Strategic Plan, Planning Integration
a. LACCD has established district-level integrated processes for strategic, financial, facilities and technology planning. These processes provide a coherent framework for district-college planning integration with the goal of promoting student learning and achievement. The District's Integrated Planning Manual is currently being updated by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the District's Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division and will be reviewed and approved by the colleges and Board of Trustees in fall 2015 (IV.D.5-2).
b. DSP measures were developed for each college, and the District as a whole, to create a uniform methodology and data sources. Colleges compare their progress against the District as a whole using the most recent three year timeframe as the point of reference. Colleges assess progress and establish targets to advance both local and District objectives. Colleges' annual assessments are reported to the Board of Trustees using a standard format, allowing for an apples-to-apples District-wide discussion (IV.D.5-3), (IV.D.5-4).

c. College institutional effectiveness reports inform the Board of Trustees on the advancement of District goals which, in turn, informs the Board's annual goal setting process and shapes future college and District planning priorities. The District Strategic Plan is reviewed at the mid-point of the planning cycle, and a final review is conducted in the last year of the cycle (IV.D.5-5), (IV.D.5-6), (IV.D.5-7).

d. The District Technology Plan created a framework of goals and a set of actions to guide District-wide technology planning. The District Technology Implementation Plan established measures and prioritized deployment of technology solutions in consideration of available resources. The District Technology Plan promotes the integration of technology planning across the colleges by establishing a common framework for college technology planning (IV.D.5-8), (IV.D.5-9).

e. District-college integration 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 college-district collaboration, coordination with centralized District service units, and interaction with an array of District-level committees (IV.D.5-10 through IV.D.5-13).

f. Planning is integrated with resource allocation at the District level through annual enrollment growth planning and the budget review process. The individual colleges, and the District as a whole, develop enrollment growth and budget projections and confer on a quarterly basis to reconcile and update enrollment, revenue, and cost projections. Updated projections are regularly reported to the District Budget Committee and the Board's Budget and Finance Committee. This high-level linkage of enrollment planning and resource allocation provides a framework for the District budget process (IV.D.5-14 through IV.D.5-17).

Planning Evaluation

g. Various mechanisms are used to evaluate the effectiveness of college-district integrated planning:

   • The Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey assesses budget development and resource allocation, enrollment management, and FTES and facilities planning (*see Standard IV.D.7*).

   • District-level planning and policy committees assess their effectiveness through an annual committee self-evaluation process (*see Standard IV.D.1*).

   • The ESC Program Review process assesses performance and outcomes through an annual User Survey and information specific to each service unit (*see Standard IV.D.2*).

   • Evaluation of District-level plans includes both an analysis of plan outcomes and a review of plan currency, relevancy, and alignment with external accountability initiatives; e.g. the Student Success Scorecard and the Statewide Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IV.D.5-18), (IV.D.5-19), (IV.D.5-20).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The District has established mechanisms for integrated District-level strategic and operational plans. This integration involves collaboration and cooperation between colleges, the ESC

service units, and District-level shared governance and administrative committees. Assessment mechanisms include direct assessment of governance and decision-making, governance committee self-evaluation, ESC Program Review, and review of District-level plans.

Even with the institutionalization of these processes, the size and complexity of the LACCD presents challenges to integrated planning and evaluation. Self-examination has revealed gaps in adherence to evaluation timelines and the need for more systematic and consistent evaluation processes and alignment across plans. The District, primarily through its Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division, continues to work on strengthening and expanding these mechanisms to improve the effectiveness of District-college integrated planning in promoting student learning and achievements.

To this end, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee has revised and strengthened its charter and has undertaken a review of all governance evaluations, as well as mid-term review of the District Strategic Plan. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has created an integrated planning manual for District-wide plans with timelines and timeframes that set a synchronized reporting cycle. The updated evaluation and reporting framework will be institutionalized in the District Governance and Functions Handbook, codifying commitment to more coordinated planning on a district-wide basis. The District meets this Standard.

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

IV.D.5-1   District Strategic Plan: Vision 2017, 2/6/2013
IV.D.5-2   LACCD Integrated Planning Manual 2015
IV.D.5-3   College Effectiveness Report Template
IV.D.5-4   IESS Committee Agendas on IE Report Approval – 2012 through 2015
IV.D.5-5   BOT Agenda, Annual Board Leadership & Planning Session – 8/19/2015
IV.D.5-6   DPAC Agenda – 6/26/2015
IV.D.5-7   DPAC Agenda – 8/28/2015
IV.D.5-8   District Technology Strategic Plan – 3/9/2011
IV.D.5-9   District Technology Implementation Plan, March – 3/21/2013
IV.D.5-10   SSSP new DEC service categories PowerPoint 2014
IV.D.5-11   SSSP Counselor Training PowerPoint 2014
IV.D.5-12   SSI Steering Committee Minutes – 8/22/2014
IV.D.5-13   SIS Fit-Gap Agendas 2013
IV.D.5-14   Quarterly College FTES Meetings – 2014 through 2015
IV.D.5-15   Quarterly enrollment report to DBC – 5/20/2015
IV.D.5-16   Quarterly enrollment report to BFC – 9/16/2015
IV.D.5-17   Budget Allocation Model – 2012 Amendment
IV.D.5-18   DPAC Minutes – June through August 2015
IV.D.5-19   BOT Agenda – 9/2/2015
IV.D.5-20   IEPI 2015-16 Goals Framework – 5/27/2017

IV.D.6

Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.

The District has numerous councils and committees which meet regularly to share best practices and to ensure an effective flow of information between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC). Additionally, a number of standing monthly reports and updates are sent electronically to established District employee list serves.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

a. In total, the District has 46 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 (IV.D.6-1).

b. 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.6-2).

c. The Councils of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and the District Administrative Council are responsible for the review and study of district-wide instructional, student services, and administrative operational and programmatic issues. Executive Administrative Council members are predominantly senior ESC administrators, college presidents and college vice presidents. All councils report to either the Chancellor directly or to the Chancellor's Cabinet. Meeting agendas and minutes are distributed to Council members in advance of meetings. Meeting schedules are set each July for the upcoming year, and generally rotate between colleges and the ESC (IV.D.6-3).

d. Four District-level Governance Committees meet monthly: (1) District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC); (2) District Budget Committee (DBC); (3) Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC); and (4) the Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC). Committee members encompass a broad range of college faculty, college researchers, and college deans, with representatives from the unions, college presidents, college vice presidents, and ESC senior administrators. These committees typically consult with one or more Executive Administrative Council and report to either the Chancellor or to the Chancellor's Cabinet (IV.D.6-4).

e. In 2013, the governance committees agreed to a common format for their web pages. Each committee's web page contains a brief description of its function, committee charge, who it reports to, who it consults with, chairs, membership, meeting information, and resources. Results of the District-wide Governance Committee Self Evaluation as well as meeting agendas, minutes, and resource documents are posted on the web page, which is accessible to the public (IV.D.6-5).

f. Sixteen Operational Committees meet monthly, or on a per-semester basis. These Committees are structured by subject/function area and coordinate with one of the Executive Administrative management councils. Committee members are largely faculty, program directors, researchers, and college deans, with representatives from the three Executive Administrative management councils and ESC senior administrative staff.

Meeting agendas and minutes are emailed to committee members in advance of each meeting (See IV.D-7) (IV.D.6-6).

g. Five Academic Initiative Committees coordinate District-wide academic programs. These committees are primarily led by faculty, but also include administrators and classified staff. These committees focus on broader goals in various areas, including labor issues, articulation, transfer, and student success (IV.D-8).

h. Information Technology maintains 78 active list serves. These list serves 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 list serve has a coordinator/owner charged with maintaining an accurate list of members (IV.D.6-9).

i. In accordance with the Brown Act, all agendas and informational documents for Board of Trustee meetings are posted in the lobby at the ESC and on the District website. They are also distributed electronically to college presidents, college vice presidents, college and the District Academic Senate presidents, and bargaining unit representatives (IV.D.6-10).

j. Policy changes are communicated by the Office of General Counsel (OGC), which disseminates memos informing campuses and constituency groups of approved changes to Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. These updates are also posted on the District's website (IV.D.6-11).

k. The Chancellor, Board of Trustees, and select ESC divisions and programs issue regular bulletins and newsletters, disseminating information on programs, accreditation, budget updates, success stories, and employee benefits. Additionally, the District Student Information System (SIS) project team has conducted forums at each college, informing all employees about the development and roll-out of the District's new student records system (IV.D.6-12 through (IV.D.6-19).

l. The Chancellor keeps the Board of Trustees, college presidents, and senior administrators abreast of Trustee matters, college/District updates and activities, legislative/public affairs updates, and community events through his weekly reports. Items often include updates on Chancellor and Board actions regarding college operations and stability (IV.D.6-20).

m. The District Academic Senate (DAS) represents the faculty of the District in all academic and professional matters. In this capacity, the President and Executive Committee regularly inform faculty of District policy discussions and decisions related to educational quality, student achievement, and the effective operation of colleges (IV.D.6-21).

n. In 2011, District Information Technology (IT) undertook a complete redesign of the District website. The updated website, which allows each division/unit in the ESC to manage its own content, launched in fall 2012. In 2013, the District updated its public interface and in December 2014, the District upgraded its internal software systems to better support the online needs of the District. Creation of web links to Board, committee, council, and program information has improved the public's and District employees' access to information about the District (IV.D.6-22).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The District ensures regular communication with the colleges and front-line employees through its committees and councils, websites, list serves, newsletters and bulletins, and email. Meeting agendas and minutes are posted online or distributed electronically. The

District's revamped website has facilitated easier access for employees to maintain, and for the public to access, District and college information.

The District's sheer size and volume of activity offers challenges to maintaining consistent engagement and communication with employees and stakeholders. While the District has improved its access to information and regular communications, it continues to look for ways to improve efforts in this area. The launch of the District's new intranet site, currently scheduled for December 2015, is anticipated to improve employee access to ESC divisions, units, and services.

In September 2015, District Educational Program and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) staff and District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) members co-presented a workshop at the annual DAS Summit. The workshop addressed 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. The District meets this Standard (IV.D.5-23).

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

IV.D.6-1	Screenshot of District Intranet of Councils and Committees
IV.D.6-2	Districtwide Executive Administrative Councils 2015 Draft Update
IV.D.6-3	Chancellor's Directive 70 – 8/30/1994
IV.D.6-4	District-level Governance Committee 2015 Update
IV.D.6-5	District-level Governance committee web page Screenshot
IV.D.6.6	District Coordinating Committees 2015 Update
IV.D.6-7	Sample Email Report from List Serve (i.e. childcare, financial aid)
IV.D.6-8	District Academic Initiative Committees 2015 Update
IV.D.6-9	District List Serve List
IV.D.6-10	Sample BOT Agenda Email
IV.D.6-11	OGC Board Rule and Admin Regs Revision Notices, July through August 2015
IV.D.6-12	LACCD Newsletters
IV.D.6-13	Chancellor Bulletins
IV.D.6-14	Accreditation Newsletters
IV.D.6-15	Diversity Newsletters
IV.D.6-16	SIS Newsletters
IV.D.6-17	Benefits and Wellness Newsletters
IV.D.6-18	Bond Program Newsletters
IV.D.6-19	SIS Forum PowerPoints
IV.D.6-20	Chancellor Weekly Email Updates
IV.D.6-21	DAS Communication – 2014 through 2015
IV.D.6-22	Web Redesign Meeting – 10/31/2011
IV.D.6-23	Districtwide Communication PowerPoint – 9/25/2015

IV.D.7

The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

The District, under the guidance of the Chancellor, regularly evaluates the effectiveness of District/college role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes. Based on recommendations made by the ACCJC in 2009, the District Planning committee (DPC) implemented a cyclical process for system-level evaluation and improvement. The District institutionalized this cycle and continues to review and revise, processes in support of institutional effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Governance and Decision-Making Assessment, Effectiveness and Communication

a. In fall 2009, the District Planning Committee (now the District Planning and Accreditation Committee) designed and administered a District governance survey. This assessment was undertaken in response to recommendations received during the spring 2009 accreditation visits at East Los Angeles, Los Angeles City, and Los Angeles Trade-Technical Colleges, and resulted in action items for continuous improvement of District/college role delineation (IV.D.7-1),(IV.D.7-2).

b. The District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Survey continues to be administered on a two-year cycle. Survey participants evaluate the quality of District-level governance in the following areas:

   • Appropriateness and effectiveness of the roles played by stakeholder groups, including administration, District Academic Senate, collective bargaining groups, and Associated Students organizations;

   • Effectiveness of district-level decision-making processes in relation to five primary governance areas: budget and resource allocation, enrollment management, strategic planning and goals setting, bond program oversight, and employee benefits;

   • Quality of district-level decision making (e.g., the extent to which decisions are based on data and are effectively communicated, implemented, and assessed), and

   • Overall assessment of administrative and Board support of participatory governance as well as the effectiveness of district-wide decision making in relation to the District's stated mission (IV.D.7-3),(IV.D.7-4).

c. The District's Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has conducted surveys, analyzed recurring themes, disseminated and discussed results, and used the results to plan improvements. Challenges in implementing improvement plans occurred, and the IE unit has restarted its survey and evaluation cycle. The unit recently completed current-year survey results and a comparative analysis of 2010, 2012 and 2014 survey results. Results were reviewed by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and plans to strengthen the survey tools and the development and implementation of improvement plans are now part of DPAC's 2015-2016 work plan. These assessment reports have been

posted online and will be reported to the Board's Institutional Effectiveness Committee in fall 2015 and used to inform recommendations for District improvement (IV.D.7-5 through IV.D.7-8).

d. In 2009, DPAC, with assistance from the IE unit, established an annual Committee Self-Evaluation process for all District governance committees. This common self-assessment documents each committee's accomplishments, challenges, and areas for improvement over the past year. Results of the assessment are reviewed by each respective committee and serve as the basis for changes and improvements to Committee function. Through their 2015-2016 work plan, DPAC reaffirmed their responsibility to ensure self-evaluations are conducted by District governance committees, results are posted online, and that they are used to inform committees' work plans (IV.D.7-9 through IV.D.7-13).

e. Role delineations are evaluated during the regular review of Functional Area maps and revisions are made based on input from governance committee members, governance surveys, ESC administrative units, the Chancellor's Cabinet, and college stakeholders. Functional Area maps were expanded and revised in 2015, and are currently under review prior to finalization (see Standard IV.D.1 and IV.D.2).

f. The District Governance and Functions Handbook is regularly reviewed and updated by District stakeholders under the coordination of the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC). A section of the Handbook describes all 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 underway as of fall 2015 (IV.D.7-14).

Analysis and Evaluation:

The District has processes to regularly evaluate district/system and college role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes. It has developed mechanisms for wide communication of the results of these evaluations. However, the District as a whole has faced challenges in the evaluation process.

Thorough self-evaluation led the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit to discover that some evaluation cycles were off-track and results had not been systematically disseminated. The unit is currently updating governance survey and committee self-assessment instruments and integrating these evaluations into the District Effectiveness Cycle (see LACCD Integrated Planning Manual), (IV.D.7-15),(IV.D.5-2).

The IE unit reported these findings and activities to DPAC, which, through its own self-examination and goal-setting process, undertook development of a comprehensive, and consistent, evaluation framework as part of its 2015-16 work plan. Adherence to the work plan will be ensured through the Committee's expanded oversight role, as reflected in its revised charter, and by assigning a specific ESC staff member to maintain District governance committee websites. The District meets this Standard (IV.D.7-8),(IV.D.7-16).

Los Angeles Mission College meets this standard.

LIST OF EVIDENCE

IV.D.7-1   2009 District Governance Survey Tool
IV.D.7-2   2010 District Governance Assessment Report – 2/26/2010
IV.D.7-3   2012 District Governance Survey Tool and Results
IV.D.7-4   2015 District Governance Survey Tool
IV.D.7-5   District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Comparison Report – 2010, 2012, 2014, and 8/28/2015
IV.D.7-6   2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Analysis – 8/19/2015
IV.D.7-7   2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Report by College and Analysis by Role – 8/28/2015
IV.D.7-8   DPAC 2015-2016 Work Plan – 8/28/2015
IV.D.7-9   Districtwide Committee Self-Evaluation Form
IV.D.7-10   DBC Self-Evaluation 2012 through 2014
IV.D.7-11   DPAC Self-Evaluation 2012 through 2014
IV.D.7-12   JLMBC Self-Evaluation 2011 though 2012
IV.D.7-13   TPCC Self-Evaluation 2011-2012, 7/19/2012
IV.D.7-14   Updated District Council and Committee List – 9/2/2015
IV.D.7-15   Governance Evaluation Timeline – 8/27/2017
IV.D.7-16   Updated DPAC Charter – 6/22/2015