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I. Report Preparation

This Midterm Report was prepared in collaboration with the Harbor College Accreditation Steering Committee:

Dr. Otto Lee (2014-continuing) and Mr. Farley Herzek (2013-14 Interim) President
Mr. Luis Rosas, Vice President, Academic Affairs and Co-Accreditation Liaison Officer
Ms. Abbie Patterson, Vice President, Student Services and Co-Chair CPC
Dr. Ann Tomlinson, Vice President, Administrative Services (2013-14)
Mr. Nestor Tan, Acting Vice President, Administrative Services (2013-14)
Dr. Kristi Blackburn, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness and Co-Accreditation Liaison Officer (2013-2014)
Dr. Bobbi Villalobos, Dean, Academic Affairs
Dr. Stephanie Atkinson-Alston, Dean, Academic Affairs and Acting Dean Institutional Effectiveness
Ms. Susan McMurray, President, Academic Senate and Co-Chair CPC
Dr. Joaquin Arias, Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator (2012-14)
Dr. Elena Reigadas, Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator (2014-continuing)
Dr. Daniel Keller, Chair Curriculum Committee
Ms. Rhea Estoya, Research Analyst, Institutional Effectiveness
Mr. Brian Henderson, Administrative Secretary, Academic Affairs
Ms. Megan Lange, Instructional Assistant, Learning Resource Center
Mr. Jim Stanbery, Ms. Yesenia King, and Dr. Ellen Joiner, Accreditation Faculty Coordinators

In preparation for Harbor College’s 2015 Midterm Report, the Accreditation Steering Committee met monthly, beginning in fall 2013, to sustain improvements and actions on assessment, program review, planning, and fiscal management. Additionally, all Accreditation Standards Teams (initially formed for the 2012 Self-Evaluation Study) met at least once each semester to gather evidence for the Midterm Report and to review activities pertinent to the Actionable Improvement Items identified in the 2012 Self Evaluation. (Attendance) On Opening Day, August 28, 2014, President Otto Lee and the campus Accreditation Faculty Coordinators presented a timetable for the Midterm Report and an update on progress to date. The Opening Day presentation was designed to increase the College community’s understanding of ongoing accreditation processes as well as to encourage all constituencies to participate in the Midterm Report development. (Opening Day presentation) The President also instituted weekly meetings with the Accreditation Steering Committee in September 2014 to regularly review the progress of the college’s planning.

Based upon evidence gathered by the Steering Committee and the Standard Teams, the Accreditation Faculty Coordinators prepared an initial draft of the 2015 Midterm Report. The Steering Committee reviewed that draft and subsequent revisions in September and early October 2014. Each Standard Team then met once in the fall 2014 semester to review a current draft of the report and to provide final updates on action items for each standard. The final draft of the Midterm Report was vetted by the College’s three planning Clusters (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services). The Academic Senate and the College Planning Council (CPC) approved the finalized report at the beginning of December. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee of the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees reviewed and approved the report in January 2015 and approval by the entire LACCD Board followed in February 2015.
II. College Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

Sustaining Progress
By March 2013, the College had successfully resolved two recommendations from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and its accreditation was reaffirmed by the Commission in July 2013. (2013 Follow-Up Report to ACCJC, 7/3/13) Moreover, the College continues to improve the institutional processes and structures covered by those two recommendations:

**College Recommendation 1:**
As previously stated in Recommendation 2 by the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation Team and in order to meet Standards, the planning process needs to reflect an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation that use data as the central focus to inform decisions. The process needs to be made clear to the college constituencies so they understand the steps, as well as which plan informs which plan. In addition, human resource planning for classified personnel and administrators needs to be evidence-based and integrated with institutional planning and program review. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the planning process as well as the effectiveness of programs and services needs to be included.

**College Recommendation 2:**
In order to meet the Standard, and to adequately monitor salary and benefit expenditures and insure the institution practices effective oversight of finances, the team recommends that salary actions should first be reviewed for available and adequate funding prior to initiating the employment process.

Continuous improvement on these recommendations has occurred even as the College experienced significant personnel changes. In June 2013, Harbor’s President Marvin Martinez accepted the presidency of East Los Angeles College. He was replaced by Interim President Farley Herzek, who served from July 2013 through July 2014. Dr. Otto Lee was selected as the College’s permanent President and assumed his duties in August 2014. Two new Academic Affairs deans, Dr. Bobbi Villalobos and Dr. Stephanie Atkinson-Alston and a new Dean of Enrollment Management and Evening Operations, Mr. Corey Rodgers, also joined the administration. Administrative Services Vice President Ann Tomlinson accepted a position at another institution and was replaced by Acting Vice President Nestor Tan, who had served as the Administrative Service Associate Vice President since 2006 and has been involved with budget and finance since 1994. The Dean for Institutional Effectiveness also left the College in September 2014. Her duties have been assumed by Dr. Atkinson-Alston, and the College anticipates filling the position in the spring of 2015. These transitions contributed to some delays in completing its 2014-2015 planning cycle; however, the cycle is complete as of January 2015. The College initiated its 2015-2016 cycle with new leadership and a renewed determination to hold itself accountable for consistent and timely planning and for stronger fiscal oversight and transparency.

Harbor College recognizes that its future success is rooted in a diligent and data-driven evaluation of its current work (e.g. courses, programs, student access and policies, facility use) and a transparent, inclusive, and methodical approach to planning, budgeting, and implementing actions to increase
institutional effectiveness. The following details the College’s specific efforts to sustain its improvements on each of the two recommendations.

Sustaining Improvements Based on Recommendation 1

A. The College’s Integrated Model Links Evaluation, Planning, and Resource Allocation

All elements of an integrated and ongoing planning and resource allocation process are outlined in the College Planning Policy and Procedures Manual that was updated and approved by the College Planning Council (CPC) in fall 2014. (Planning Policy & Procedures Manual) Planning flow and resource allocation are visually displayed in Figure 1.

The three-year Strategic Educational Master Plan provides the overall direction for College planning and resource allocation while regularly scheduled Program Reviews provide the ongoing foundation of essential data that continually informs the entire planning process. Harbor College allocates its resources through thoughtful review and assessment of program review data, integrated planning, and final implementation through the Annual College Plan. The development of the Annual College Plan begins with systematic program review by the College departments and divisions. Data analysis also informs the College’s Functional Plans, which are presented to the CPC (College Planning Council) early in the planning process. These presentations encourage the exchange of information, dialogue, and the incorporation of current functional evidence into the Annual Unit Plans. (Program Reviews; Unit Plans)

The Annual Unit Plans clarify the goals of a specific Unit as well as their required allocation. All Units in the College are grouped into one of three planning Clusters (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services). Representatives on each Cluster Committee review and prioritize the Annual Unit Plans within their respective Clusters to create an Annual Cluster Plan. The three Vice Presidents, in turn, present their Annual Cluster Plan to CPC. The College Budget Committee contributes to planning by providing the Unit, Clusters, and CPC all relevant college and district fiscal data and projections. The Budget Committee also analyzes current fiscal trends and anticipates future scenarios that impact the College budget (Budget Committee minutes). It may also provide projected allocation targets based on the prior year as a planning guide.

The three Cluster plans are evaluated and discussed in an open meeting of the CPC. The members then prioritize items from the various Cluster Plans into an Annual College Plan. (Cluster Plans; Annual College Plan) The Annual College Plan is comprised of extracted goal-driven and data-supported requests for personnel/equipment/supplies from the Annual Cluster, Functional and state required plans. The plan is reviewed by the CPC which amends, guides, approves, and recommends resource allocations. In turn, the Budget Committee reviews resource requests for potential leveraging and feasibility of campus funding, makes appropriate recommendations and contingent approvals to the President’s Cabinet. Final allocations of resources at Harbor College are at the discretion of the President in consultation with his Cabinet.
FIGURE 1. LAHC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION
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B. Systematic Cycle of Evaluation of Student, Service Area, Program, and Institutional Outcomes

Assessment data is used extensively in the College’s ongoing evaluation and improvement of student, program, and institutional outcomes. In spring 2014, Harbor College offered 581 courses with 100% of those classes reporting defined outcomes and 524 or 90% of courses with completed assessments. In fall 2014, program assessment stands at 87% with the remaining programs/pathways in process to bring the college to 100% completion. (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment) To encourage assessment at the program level, the Assessment Committee has ensured assessment completion on a semester-by-semester basis and also encouraged disciplines and divisions to more clearly align student, program, and institutional outcomes. Such alignment streamlines the assessment process, allows the use of one evaluation tool for all three (student, program, and Institutional) levels of assessment, and further enhances cross-campus dialogue (see Figure 2).

FIGURE 2. ALIGNING THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS IN SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

In the Social and Behavioral Science division, the psychology faculty fully aligned all course SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) to the program and institutional outcomes. History faculty reviewed the discipline’s critical thinking and writing outcome which is an SLO for every history course. Over the course of three meetings held in 2013-14, various history faculty presented examples of student writing to their colleagues and discussed teaching strategies as applied to specific learning outcomes in various courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE SLOs -</th>
<th>PLO #1 -</th>
<th>ILO #2 -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hist52- #1 Identify the dynamic of historical continuity and change in U.S. Women’s History</td>
<td>Students will summarize and critically analyze graphic and textual information.</td>
<td>Cognition: Use critical thinking skills to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate ideas and information. Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hist12- #3 Critically evaluate the impact of industrialization, immigration, and urbanization on American society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Soc.1- #8 The student will be able to describe the use of surveys as a research method.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PolSci 1- #1 Students will summarize and critically analyze graphic and textual information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Psych 41-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• #4 Apply psychological principles to social and organizational developmental issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• #6 'Develop insight into their own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies as they relate to age-related events and life events, both normative and non-normative (e.g., teratology, transitional events, dying and death).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
history courses. The dialogue resulted in a revamping and combining of several SLOs in certain courses as well as developing new pedagogical tools for teaching the associated skills. (History Minutes) A similar pattern of dialogue and positive change occurred in the Anthropology department. Based on their current SLO findings, the Anthropology Department revised course SLOs to involve standard means of assessment in all classes with a primary focus on hands-on, active, and authentic assessments. (Anthropology Minutes) Similarly, based upon assessment results and departmental dialogue, the Political Science and Sociology Departments consolidated SLOs, revamped assessment tools, and implemented pedagogical and curricular changes. (Political Science and Sociology Assessment)

Service Area Outcomes. Dialogue has been stimulated by presentations of outcomes and assessment results by area managers at monthly meetings. Such communication includes all service areas and serves to identify and minimize obstacles to student success. (Student Services Cluster Committee Minutes) The Counseling Division, based on data provided by focus groups in 2012 and with impetus from the Student Success Initiative, provides one-on-one contact sessions to entering first year students. Working through Outreach, the college strengthened its relationship with feeder high schools to smooth the transition to college and provide consistent assessment, orientation, counseling, and follow-up. These services are the heart of a First Year Experience program (2013) which has now evolved into the Harbor Advantage program (2014) and provides a dedicated counselor to all students enrolled in the program. Also in response to data analysis, the Early Alert Program more directly addresses student needs by alerting them to potential progress problems via a contact from a counselor who has been alerted by the instructor and by providing workshops in areas such as study skills and time management.

Program and Institutional Outcomes. Beginning in 2008, Harbor College systematically assessed one of its Institutional Learning Outcomes (ISLO) each year. By 2014, strong participation and cooperation across the campus has resulted in the assessment of all institutional outcomes (ISLO # 1,2,3,4, and 5). Institutional assessment results are posted on the assessment site. (Institutional SLO Assessment) Following the evaluation of ISLO #5 data, the Assessment Committee recommended a merger of two institutional outcomes (ISLO#4-Social Responsibility and ISLO#5-Personal Development) into one outcome (ISLO#4- Social and Personal Responsibility) that will be re-assessed within the regular cycle. ISLO# 1 (Communication) was assessed in fall 2014. (Institutional SLO Assessment)

The Library has been very effective in coordinating institutional assessment of ISLO #3 (Information Competency). In fall 2011, the Library conducted information literacy workshops that were assessed with pre and post-tests. Classes from a variety of disciplines participated in the workshops and the resulting data was shared with faculty. (ISLO #3 Assessment Results) Although students demonstrated improvement in the post test, a limiting aspect of the design was not being able to see the impact of the workshops on the overall student success in the course. As a result, the ISLO #3 assessment was revamped with a four-class pilot study designed to use library workshops again but also to integrate the library instruction more directly into class research assignments, and indirectly to see the impact of the workshops on students’ success in the courses. The pilot study with participants from English, Speech, Psychology, and History was conducted in fall 2014 and was specifically designed to examine students’ ability to locate and use a variety of research sources and apply this knowledge to course assignments. Results of this pilot will be reviewed in spring 2015 with broader participation anticipated in the fall 2015 semester.

Improving the Effectiveness of Programs and Services. In addition to ongoing review of assessment results, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness encourages data-driven dialogue by posting the yearly Fact Book, Achieving the Dream, and internal/external data on the college internal network, making it
accessible to all faculty and unit managers. Student learning and service area outcomes are regularly updated and posted on the college website. All course syllabi include learning outcomes, and all instructors are encouraged to review these outcomes throughout the semester. The Standard II A Accreditation Team (Instructional Programs) developed an outcomes template to serve as a starting point for discussion at Division and Cluster meetings (Table 1). The template is used at Department and managerial meetings as a tool for reviewing outcomes, reporting assessment results in all areas, identifying and minimizing obstacles to student success, and using data to implement change. (Social and Behavioral Sciences Minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions Intended for Divisions:</th>
<th>Questions Intended for Student/Academic Services:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What courses were assessed? Total number of students assessed? Total number of classes/instructors participating?</td>
<td>What program areas were assessed? Total number of faculty/staff participating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What SLOs were assessed?</td>
<td>What SLOs/ASOs were assessed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your findings?</td>
<td>What were your findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes in course instruction will result from this data?</td>
<td>What changes in services will result from this data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes in curriculum, discipline, program, and division will result from this data?</td>
<td>What changes in curriculum and/or program area will result from this data?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 1. Stimulating the Campus-Wide Dialogue on SLOs

### C. Strengthening Student Success through Data-Driven Decisions and Actions

Data is at the core of Harbor College’s planning and allocation process. Figure 3 summarizes the sources of data that inform the college’s planning documents, and in turn, determine specific interventions.

### FIGURE 3. Planning and Resource Allocation Decisions Informed by Data

In 2011, Harbor College joined Achieving the Dream, a Lumina Foundation supported national reform network focused on community college student success (ATD) and applied the ATD college framework for integrated planning, resource allocation, and continuous evaluation to identify and implement
effective success interventions. Facilitation and oversight for this data-driven, informed decision making approach rests with the Student Success Evidence Committee (SSEC) and the Student Success Umbrella (SSU). Support for this data-driven decision model comes from both committees. The SSEC, which began as the ATD Data Team and was institutionalized as the SSEC in 2014, is co-chaired by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. (SSEC Minutes\textsuperscript{17}) The SSEC provides data and analysis to both the Academic Affairs and Student Services divisions and areas in order to assist college stakeholders in creating success strategies. The SSEC is also instrumental in facilitating the creation and implementation of evaluation plans for the intervention strategies. The SSU, which began as the ATD Core Team, (the Core Team reviewed data and recommended strategies for ATD success interventions) coordinates the College’s student success efforts and leads in reviewing proposals and evaluating the efforts. (SSU Minutes\textsuperscript{18}) The Umbrella is key to ensuring that the success strategies across campus are aligned and support student success goals as established in the College planning process.

In fall 2014, Harbor College was recognized as an Achieving the Dream Leader College based on its implementation of success strategies, informed by evaluation of data, which led to increased fall-to-spring persistence rates for all students in the ATD cohort and specifically for Hispanic students. Application of the data-driven decision and evaluation model resulted in a number of sustained interventions and college-wide plans to enhance student success, including:

- A First Year Experience (FYE) program was initiated in fall 2012 after the ATD Core team reviewed data provided by the ATD Data team. This review included numerous sources, including persistence and completion rates. Focus groups with student leaders were also conducted to share the data with students and obtain their input. (Student focus group presentation\textsuperscript{19}) The data analysis indicated that Harbor students experience consistently low retention rates. Based on the analysis, the ATD Core team recommended to the College Planning Council that a first year experience program be established and funded and include a redesign of student orientation and assessment processes; assessment preparation; and cohort scheduling of and English, general elective, personal development and service learning courses. The ATD Core team set a goal for the FYE program of an improved retention rate of 10% in the initial year. Seventy students participated in the first FYE, and an analysis of the data determined that the intervention was a success. In fall 2012, the retention rate for students in the FYE English class was 16% higher, and the overall success rate was 30% higher than for students in a comparison group. (FYE Course Retention & Completion\textsuperscript{20}) Based on this success, the cohort was increased to 120 students in fall 2013, and in fall 2014, the Student Success Umbrella recommended that the FYE program be included in the Educational Master Plan as the Harbor Advantage, a scaled FYE that provides all first time in college students who want to participate a guaranteed prescribed program of study; mandatory assessment, orientation, and counseling; and faculty mentors in the student’s career pathway. (CPC minutes 3/10/14\textsuperscript{21}) Harbor Advantage is also included in the Student Success and Support Program Plan, and the Student Equity Plan. (Student Success and Support Program Plan; Student Equity Plan\textsuperscript{22}) First semester evaluation data for the Harbor Advantage is being reviewed by the SSEC and the SSU, whose memberships include both academic and student services faculty and staff.

- Another success intervention initiated through data review is Math Success and Completion. The math department, in conjunction with the ATD Core and Data teams, reviewed placement data, three-year completion rates for the developmental math sequence, and the completion to graduation timeframe for students placing 4-levels below college level. The data showed that the three-year completion rate was 3.5%, and the completion to graduation time was six years. (Math Follow Up Survey; Math Placements\textsuperscript{23}) To improve in these areas, the department included the following yearly goals in its Unit Plan: increase the developmental math sequence
completion rate from 3.5% to 5.5% in the first year and to shorten the time it takes students starting 4-levels below college level to complete a college-level math class from six to three years. (Math & Technology Unit Plan) Many changes were made to meet these goals, including the creation of Math 137 (Pre-Statistics), a one semester class that takes the place of Math 123A-B-C and provides non-math majors (non-STEM) a shorter pathway to college-level Statistics. The faculty also created Math 115 (Elementary Algebra) and Math 125 (Intermediate Algebra) with lab sections to shorten the developmental math pathway from three to two courses. These changes, implemented in fall 2014, are currently being evaluated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the math department and will be reviewed by the Student Success Evidence Committee and the Student Success Umbrella for further recommendations as appropriate.

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

D. Planning Process Institutionalized and Widely Disseminated

In order to further clarify the planning process to all college constituencies, the Standard IIIA accreditation team, in cooperation with Academic Affairs and the Senate Academic Planning and Policy Committee, revised the Faculty Handbook and presented it to the Senate for approval in August 2014. In addition to providing vital information for all Harbor faculty, the handbook explains the planning process and the responsibility of each faculty member in its implementation. CD copies of the Faculty Handbook were distributed at the College’s 2014 Opening Day. (Faculty Handbook)

Furthermore, in early fall 2014, the CPC approved a sequential representation of the LAHC Planning Timeline which is annualized over one academic year (Figure 4). While the CPC affirmed the continual alignment of planning documents and the ongoing cyclical nature of the planning process, the annualized structure shown in Figure 4 offers a visual chronology for all plans and planning deadlines within the academic year and illustrates which plans inform other plans. Perhaps most importantly, the timeline clearly answers the question “where do we begin?” in the planning cycle.
Following the timeline, Cluster plans were completed on time during 2012-2013 planning cycle. In the 2013-2014 and 2014-15 cycle, all three Clusters again completed their plans while responding to significant changes and increased workloads resulting from a number of State required student success initiative plans and reports (e.g. Student Success and Support Plan, Student Equity Plan). The College and its new leadership are committed to adhering to the College’s plans, processes, and deadlines. The 2015-16 planning cycle is on schedule; Functional Plans for the 2015-16 cycle have been prepared and approved by the College Planning Council in preparation for Unit and Cluster plan updates. (College Functional Plans)

A Shared Governance calendar that includes all planning meetings and dates, as well as a College Planning Documents Calendar, establishes deadlines for the submission of all planning documents. (Shared Governance Calendar) Specific duties of the various constituencies are outlined in the “The Planning Process: How We Plan” document that was reviewed and approved by CPC. (Planning Process) This document provides a concise narrative that describes each planning document, clarifies the relationship between each document and those that follow, and identifies the area, committee, or office responsible for its completion on the planning schedule.

E. Parallel Planning for Classified and Administrative Positions
Planning for classified and administrative positions mirrors the College’s Faculty Hiring Priority Committee (FHPC) that prioritizes and recommends all faculty hiring. The FHPC model is evidence-based. All FHPC members evaluate hiring requests with a common rubric based on College goals. (FHPC Rubric) Similarly, the policy and practices of the Human Resource Committee are designed to support the mission and values of the College and provide a staffing plan for classified personnel. Based on summaries of Cluster data, internal and external scans, and budget projections, the Human Resources Plan, developed by the committee and approved in January 2015, informs the Annual Plan with specific personnel information. (Human Resources Plan) In addition, all constituencies now use a position request form that clarifies the budgetary implications of each hire. As a result of the work of the Human Resources Committee, planning for the classified and administrative positions that are needed to effectively meet the needs of students are integrated into the planning process.

An example of this integration is the College’s newly hired webmaster. For many years, Harbor College was without a webmaster and as a result, the College’s online presence lacked coherence and
organization. In fall 2013, the Human Resources Committee identified this issue and prioritized the hiring of an interim webmaster. The position had the support of all three Clusters and was prioritized and approved by the College Planning Council. With the webmaster’s expertise, the College is updating and reorganizing its online presence, thereby enhancing communication and student web access.

F. Evaluation of the Planning Process
Harbor College has made progress in the evaluation of its planning processes. Using 2012-2013 (the first year following the first completed planning cycle) as a cyclical baseline, CPC organized a planning retreat in February 2014. Widespread attendance and interaction across planning units was followed by a survey asking respondents to examine the alignment of Unit/Cluster/College planning. The retreat and subsequent evaluation was dedicated to a comprehensive evaluation of outcomes and processes (2012-2013 cycle). The comprehensive report included evaluation of all major planning documents for the college (Education Master Plan, Annual College Plan, Technology Plan, Human Resources Plan, and the Unit and Cluster plans). Retreat participants also evaluated the CPC committee structure in terms of processes and outcomes. (Planning Evaluation Comprehensive Report) Recommendations from the planning retreat were systematically presented and discussed at CPC meetings throughout fall 2014. Following CPC input, numerous adjustments were implemented (e.g. re-organization within the Presidential Cluster, streamlining of the Unit and Cluster templates, implementation of the sequential timeline). (CPC Minutes 9/22/14; 10/13/14) As noted earlier, a CPC taskforce also updated the Policy and Procedures Manual in fall 2014. Additional changes resulting from the retreat recommendations (including the possible extension of the planning cycle to three years) will be made through amendments to the Participatory Governance document in the upcoming planning cycle.

In spring 2014, the College also evaluated its outcomes assessment process. In an assessment survey, a majority of the respondents affirmed that Harbor’s Institutional Outcomes reflect the goals and rigor of higher education. Ninety percent of the respondents view the college’s assessment processes and the ongoing use of assessment data positively and felt connected to data-driven dialogue and decision-making. Survey respondents also recognized the level of collaborative discussion that occurs at the course level but urged stronger dialogue and broader publication of Program and Institutional outcomes in order to encourage even stronger cross-campus dialogue. (Assessment Evaluation) As a result of this evaluation work, college constituencies are more informed about the planning process and data is more effectively collected, evaluated, and used in campus-wide decision-making.

Sustaining Improvements Based on Recommendation 2

The College maintains effective oversight of its salary and benefit expenditures and ensures that budgetary decisions are transparent and thoroughly vetted within the planning process. This process, which includes a vigilant monitoring of operational expenditures and the ongoing evaluation of academic, administrative, and student services, resulted in a successful balance of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) growth, maintenance of the Faculty Obligation Number (FON), and the promotion of quality programs college-wide.

Effective financial oversight has been maintained through transparent budget reporting. The Budget Committee, co-chaired by a faculty leader and the Vice President of Administrative Services, meets monthly and includes administrative, faculty, and classified representation. (Budget Committee Minutes) According to the College’s Planning Policy and Procedures Manual, the charge of the Budget Committee is to “provide CPC (College Planning Council) and the Cluster planning committees with all
relevant college and fiscal data and projections.” Actual Cluster funding results from CPC’s prioritization of proposed Cluster activities that are reflected in the Annual College Plan. The Vice President of Administrative Services regularly posts the monthly and quarterly budget projections along with other relevant budget information to the web. (Budget documents: Position Request form 2014; Request to Hire or Extend 2014[1]) Consistent monthly meetings and stronger oversight by the Grants Committee (co-chaired by a faculty member and an administrator) ensures that grant information is also transparent and is incorporated into the planning process. (Grants Committee[2]) Beginning in fall 2014, the President also provides a regular campus-wide update that includes budget allocations for specific Clusters. (President’s Updates[3]) New leadership at the Presidential and Vice Presidential (Administrative Services) levels, along with new leadership on the Budget Committee, has reinvigorated the entire budget process and its integration into the annual planning process.

Since salary and benefits account for ninety percent of the College annual budget, the review of salary actions prior to their initiation is critical to ensure prudent financial management. At the beginning of the planning year, Vice Presidents are notified of the funds available to each Cluster for the fiscal year. The Vice Presidents, in conjunction with the deans, unit managers, and division chairs, review all proposed expenditures and personnel actions within that specific Cluster for available and adequate funding. For faculty, the Faculty Hiring Priority Committee reviews full-time position requests and prioritizes a list of full-time hires. (FHPC[4]) After meticulous scrutiny and confidence that the funding will be sustained, the President authorizes full-time faculty and administrative searches and hires. For the last three years, the College met its FON (Faculty Obligation Number) obligation and invigorated its programs with sixteen full-time hires while at the same time maintaining a balanced budget.

The Human Resources Committee, with the development of the Human Resources Plan, provides oversight and a college-wide perspective for all classified positions. (Human Resources Plan[5]) A position decision requires the filing of a position request form that includes a complete reporting of all expenses involved with that hire and its funding source. The Vice President of Administrative Services must certify that the Cluster information is accurate and fulfills the priorities of the Annual College Plan and that adequate funds are available. The President then reviews the proposal, confers with the President’s Cabinet, and gives final approval assuming adequate funds are available and can be sustained. The budget or personnel action is transmitted to the District Office with the funding source clearly identified.

In short, the mantra for the College’s financial mode of operation (as reported in the 2013 Follow-Up Report) is “clarify, certify, verify, and approve.” As the result of this protocol, three positions were cancelled in 2012 when the college recognized there was a shortage of funds to support them. The full-time hire of a director of the Child Development Center was also delayed for a year while the program reviewed and more clearly identified the program’s goals and objectives. In 2014, the death of a counselor left an open counseling position at the beginning of the fall semester. Through its Cluster planning, Student Services will evaluate the overall counseling program, identify the areas of greatest need, and determine the most effective full-time hire to be requested through the Faculty Hiring Priority Committee process.

Perhaps the College’s rigorous monitoring of salary and benefit expenditures and its effective oversight of finances are best demonstrated in the numbers themselves. College finances in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 planning cycles have ended with a positive balance, and the current 2014-15 year is positioned to also end with a positive net balance. (LACCD Budget[6]) This positive balance is a testament to Harbor College’s campus-wide buy-in to the planning process, its budgetary implications, and its promise of greater program efficiency and student improvement.
III. District Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

Sustaining Progress
The May 2013 Follow-Up Visit Report from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges included four Recommendations to be addressed by the Los Angeles Community College District. By February 2014, the LACCD had taken significant actions in response to those Recommendations.

- In a letter from the ACCJC in February 2014, the Commission acknowledged that the District had addressed Recommendation 1 and 2 by strengthening oversight of the bond program and by implementing appropriate systems to prevent future audit exceptions due to prior weaknesses and deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit. The letter acknowledged that the District met the associated Eligibility Requirements and Standards associated with Recommendations 1 and 2. (ACCJC Letter43)
- As directed in Recommendation 4, at the time of the last self-evaluation report and visit to Harbor College in March 2012, the District was finalizing a thorough review of its budget allocation model. The process had been underway since May 2011, when the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC) began analyzing the District’s budget allocation formula, base allocations, use of ending balance policy, assessments for District Educational Services Center operations, enrollment growth targets, and college deficit repayment policies. After much review and deliberation, the District Budget Committee (DBC) approved the new budget allocation model, which was adopted by the Board on June 13, 2012. (Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism; Board Minutes, p. 6, 06/13/1244)
- As directed in Recommendation 5, in 2012 the District implemented a comprehensive Board development program. Training was held in February, April, and November of 2012. Topics included helping Board members distinguish their responsibilities from those of the Chancellor, understand their roles in setting policy, and develop goals and objectives. (Board Minutes: 2/21/12; 4/19/12; 11/13/1245)

The District continues to improve processes and structures covered in the four recommendations:

District Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend that the District actively and regularly review the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the progress in the planned lifting of the moratorium to ensure the financial integrity of the bond programs, and the educational quality of its institutions as affected by the delays of the planned facilities projects (Standard III.B.1.a; III.D.2.a; IV.B.1.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

District Recommendation 2
In order to ensure the financial integrity of the District and the colleges, and to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend the resolution of the material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit be fully effected by the
completion of next year’s audit, and appropriate systems be implemented and maintained to prevent future audit exceptions (Standards III.D.2.a; IV.B.1.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

District Recommendation 4
To fully respond to the recommendation first tendered by the Comprehensive Evaluation Team in 2006, and to reflect a realistic assessment of financial resources, financial stability, and the effectiveness of short- and long-term financial planning for the district and the colleges, and in order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the Teams recommend that the district adopt and fully implement as soon as is practicable an allocation model for its constituent colleges that addresses the size, economies of scale, and the stated mission of the individual colleges (IIID.1.b, IIID.1.c, IIID.2.c, IVB.3.c; Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18).

District Recommendation 5
To meet the Standard, the Teams recommend that the Board of Trustees make visible, in behavior and in decision-making, their policy role and their responsibility to act as a whole in the public’s interest. Further, the Teams recommend continuing professional development for the Board of Trustees to ensure a fuller understanding of its role in policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the Chancellor or his designee (IVB.1.a).

District Actions Leading to Resolution of Recommendation 1

When Recommendation 1 was received in July 2012, the District was already in the process of improving its bond oversight and the fiscal integrity of the program; however, the visiting team identified areas needing improvement for the District to fully meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements. The District had already formed an Independent Review Panel in April 2011. The Panel issued a report on the District’s Building Program which included 17 recommendations covering diverse areas including: sustaining the maintenance and operations (M&O) cost of new buildings, training on ethical considerations, creation of an Executive Director of Facilities position, imposing a moratorium, modifying the college/district management structure, program costs and financial reporting, and handling of change orders. (Independent Review Panel Report46)

The District submitted a Special Report on April 1, 2013, which described actions taken to address the Review Panel recommendations. Additional actions that the Chancellor and Board took included the creation of a Capital Construction Committee of the full Board to replace the three-member Infrastructure Committee; revision of reports to reflect more accurate college project budgets and forecasts; formation of a Board Ad Hoc Committee to consider additional policies to related to oversight and control, and the creation of the Independent Office of Inspector General and Whistleblower Program. (District Special Report47)

A two-person ACCJC evaluation team visited the District Office in May 2013 and issued a report in which the team concluded that “…Tremendous progress has been made on the review of the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the moratorium that is being lifted in phases based on the merit of each project…” (ACCJC Visiting Team Report48)

The ACCJC’s formal response, dated July 3, 2013, concurred with the progress and asked for it to be solidified in a follow-up report:
....the District had conducted a thorough review of the Bond Oversight Structure including the formation of an Independent Review Panel, the hiring of a new District Executive Director of Facilities Planning and Development, and an evaluation of the Total Cost of Ownership for facilities....however...the District is continuing to implement the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel and is considering additional Ad Hoc Committees policies to strengthen bond oversight and control. The Report should identify continuing actions that ensure the District's oversight of this construction program. (ACCJC Letter)

The District responded in October 2013, noting progress made and actions taken to address the Independent Review Panel’s recommendations (District Follow-Up Report). These actions included:

1. The moratorium, which allowed the District to step back and conduct a thorough evaluation to determine whether certain criteria had been met, was concluded.
2. The District created Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that incorporate industry standards as benchmarks to allow assessment of effectiveness of the centralized model.
3. The Board funded the District’s bond program reserve. Subsequently, projects underwent risk analysis to determine the adequacy of the set-aside. Reports are reviewed to monitor and mitigate potential risk and training on risk management is provided.
4. The reconciliation process developed as a result of this recommendation was institutionalized, with meetings held monthly.
5. Outside Construction Counsel reviewed the ten percent change order limit and concluded it was too restrictive. As a result, the Board planned to change the District’s change order policy to be consistent with other community colleges in the state.
6. A Board Resolution restructured the bond program management to a more centralized approach.
7. The District developed and implemented an energy program headed by AECOM (the new bond program manager) which assessed the return on investment (ROI) of past projects and the use of remaining funds, including Prop 39, for future energy-related projects.
8. The District began upgrades to the Student Information System (SIS) and implementation of the CMMS (work and service order system) and the District physical one-card security system. The Board continues to receive regular reports on progress made to these technology initiatives.
9. A third delivery model, Lease-Leaseback, was introduced to allow “best value” selection, help minimize the number of change orders, and allow for contingencies during construction.
10. The District reviewed and updated existing procedures, revised where needed, and developed new ones for better oversight and control. New Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) were also established. The bond program management firm implemented Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) to improve outcomes related to quality, cost, and scheduling.
11. No further District action was required in the area of hard vs. soft costs.
12. The District received official acceptance of its methodology regarding compliance with Proposition 39 from the California State Attorney General.
13. The District restructured the District Citizens Oversight Committee (DCOC) to include a smaller group that utilizes industry experts, so it can ensure current industry standards are followed and the committee can function more effectively.
14. The District hired a new Facilities Executive Director (March 2012).
15. The Board hired a new program management firm, AECOM, a recognized industry leader in the field of project management. The District retained approximately one-third of the original program management staff to ensure a seamless transition.
16. The District conducted a study on long-term Maintenance and Operations (M&O) needs and reviewed benchmarks related to industry standards.

17. Ethical compliance training is conducted annually. Additionally, in August 2013, the Board of Trustees created the Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMP&OC), which replaced the Capital Construction Committee. (Board Agenda, 8/21/13; Board Minutes, 8/21/13) This committee allows Trustees to research and evaluate facilities-related decisions more completely. The Whistleblower Program was also continued under the District’s Internal Audit Department, while the District released an RFP for a Bond Program Monitor. (RFP for Bond Program Monitor)

Ongoing Progress
The Board and the District have continued to implement the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel and additional Ad Hoc Committee policies to strengthen bond oversight and control.

Continuing actions include:

- **Building Program Management Structure.** The District has continued to refine its performance measures to ensure they incorporate industry standards and assess the effectiveness of its centralized model. The program manager has implemented Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that focus on quality, cost, and schedule. Monthly performance scores are evaluated and used to monitor the program’s progress as well as the performance indicators’ effectiveness in capturing the data and measuring the effectiveness of the building program. (LACCD CPM KPIs)

- **Program Reserve.** Projects have continued to undergo risk analysis to determine the adequacy of the bond program reserves and set-aside for anticipated and unanticipated costs. Risk management reports on each project continue to be reviewed by District program management in order to monitor and mitigate potential risks. (Risk Overview Facilities Director’s Report)

- **Audit Update to Financial Reporting.** The District CFO and the Program Management Office continue the reconciliation process by meeting together monthly.

- **Managing Change Orders.** Despite outside counsel’s original assessment that the District’s ten percent change order limit was too restrictive, further research showed that the District’s change order policy is consistent with other community colleges in the state. Therefore, no revisions have been made to the District’s change order policy. (FMP&OC Minutes, 4/30/14; Change Order Memorandum)

- **Energy Program.** An energy program review and update was presented to the Board in August 2014. (AECOM Districtwide Energy Program Overview)

- **Audit and Evaluate Design Management.** Three delivery options for capital projects: 1) Design-Bid-Build; 2) Design-Build; and 3) Lease-back are being used for all three bond projects. The Lease-Leaseback option, added in 2013, minimizes the number of change orders and allows for contingencies during construction. The Board’s FMP&OC was presented with an update on the delivery options in June 2014. (FMP&OC Agenda, 6/25/14; College Budget Recovery Plan presentation) The majority of the remaining projects will use the Lease-Leaseback method. (Board Agenda and Minutes, 8/6/14)

- **Better Control of Construction Management.** The new Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that resulted from a review of existing procedures are now web-enabled and available 24/7 to project and program stakeholders. (Web Enabled SOPs) All parties who need to use the SOPs have received training. All the fields have been audited against the SOPs. AECOM has initiated internal quality audits of the entire bond program and has already conducted a full round of audits for all campuses.
• **Review and Revise the District Citizen's Oversight Committee (DCOC).** The Board made changes to the DCOC’s membership to improve its functioning. ([Board Rule 17002 and 17004 Revisions](60)) The restructured DCOC is a smaller group (reduced from 17 to 10) with a higher percentage of industry experts, four of whom have a strong construction background. The Committee meets quarterly and met four times in 2014. During the past year, the Committee shifted its focus to construction project review and spends much of their time reviewing and discussing construction/bond projects and bond audits. As the two-year terms for Committee members cycle through, it will be easier to evaluate whether increasing the percentage of industry experts has had a positive impact on the Committee’s effectiveness.

• **Building Program Management.** The contract of AECOM, the program management firm hired in spring 2013, specifies deliverables designed to continue and enhance effective and responsible oversight and operation of the bond program. AECOM presented an overview of the District’s implementation of green, renewable and sustainable energy projects at the nine colleges and its role in energy stewardship. ([AECOM Districtwide Energy Program Overview](61))

• **Impact of New Facilities on Long Term Operating Budgets.** AECOM and Hickling and Associates LLC presented their findings and recommendations to the FMP&OC regarding the District’s custodial and building maintenance services. The presentation employed industry-based facilities performance indicators to compare District’s services and needs with similar-sized educational institutions using. Recommendations focused on developing a centralized custodial deployment strategy, including central training and cleaning inspection programs, as well as standardized equipment, supplies, and products. It also suggested a standard set of performance metrics for reporting costs, staffing density, and service levels. ([AECOM Facilities Lifecycle Review](62)) A follow-up report explained how this mandate would be accomplished. ([Custodial Services Enhancement Program](63))

• **Ethical Considerations.**
  - Compliance training continues to be conducted annually for the staff. Three trainings were conducted in August 2014: Cost Principles Training, Program Labor Log Training, and The Color of Money. ([Color of Money, Cost Principles and Program Labor Log Training Presentations](64)) Training on conflict of interest is also conducted with district and college building staff annually. ([Conflict of Interest Training Presentation](65))
  - On April 26, 2012, the Chancellor issued an interim directive mandating a conflict-of-interest checking process for the building program and directed the development of a comparable procedure for the District’s operational matters. The Conflict of Interest checklist is also requested from each member of the oversight committees on a biannual basis. ([Chancellor Directive 152](66))
  - In 2012, the District automated its Form 700 process through the implementation of the EDisclosure online portal. The District’s known designated filers are inputted and updated in the system. An annual filing notice is sent to all identified designated filers via e-mail in early March, approximately one month before the filing deadline of April 1st. The Office of General Counsel (OGC) also runs reports in EDisclosure to determine which filers have not filed, and generates escalation messages accordingly. The Information Technology unit recently developed a link with the District’s payroll system to automate notifications when filers assume or leave office. ([Form 700 Memo from Goulet](67))
  - To improve overall conflict of interest and Form 700 processes, the OGC has been meeting with other District administrators and building program staff (Form 700 Group) on a regular basis since 2012 and on a biweekly basis since fall 2013. The group’s work
has focused in parallel on developing conflict-of-interest checking and on refining the e-filing and follow-up on Form 700s.

- In winter 2014, the Contracts Unit implemented an updated flowchart, and a conflict-of-interest form comparable to the one in Chancellor’s Directive #152 has now been applied to all formal competitive processes. (Updated Conflict of Interest Flowchart) All contract ratifications pursuant to Procurement Policies and Procedures 04-05 through 04-08 include an affirmative step of checking for direct, financial conflicts of interest. In collaboration with the Form 700 Group, the OGC drafted a proposed Administrative Regulation, which will provide a narrative documentation of the procedure included in the attached flowchart. This Administrative Regulation has been circulated for final comments, and adoption is expected by the end of November 2014.

- Conflict-of-interest training is included in the semi-annual Legal Crash Course presented for administrators, and it has been presented to the Educational Services Center Senior Staff. Supplemental stand-alone presentations have been made as requested by the colleges. (Legal Crash Course presentation) Additionally, all Trustees earned a certificate for completing a public service ethics training during June through October 2013. (Board’s ethics training certificates)

**Additional Actions**

The Board’s Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMP&OC) continues to review and evaluate colleges’ Facilities Master Plans (FMPs). They have reviewed FMPs for Harbor (August 21, 2013), West (November 20, 2013), East’s Firestone site (February 26, 2014), and Pierce (June 16, 2014) so far. The Committee will complete the review of the remaining five FMPs after appropriate internal review and planning. (FMP&OC Minutes, 8/21/13; 11/20/13; 2/26/14; 6/16/14)

Each college has developed a Strategic Execution Plan (SEP) for the final phase of their building programs. The plans align remaining projects to remaining funds, standardize contingencies, address project risks, and confirm bond compliance. Each college’s SEP established a baseline for all remaining facility construction work and included a prioritization list for each college’s remaining projects. All colleges developed and approved their respective SEPs between March 2014 and June 2014. The FMP&OC was presented with an update on the delivery options in June 2014. (FMP&OC Minutes, 6/25/14) A presentation made to the Bond Steering Committee in July 2014 illustrated the Strategic Execution Plan process, a summary of remaining work at each college, and next steps. (Bond Steering Committee Strategic Execution Plans Report)

**District Actions Leading to Resolution of Recommendation 2**

The District began addressing Recommendation 2 immediately after receiving it in July 2012 and formally reported on its progress in a report submitted in April 2013. (District Special Report) The ACCJC team noted in its May 2013 evaluation report “Considerable progress has been made to resolve audit issues identified in the 2010 audit report...As a follow-up, the 2013 audit report should be reviewed as part of the normal financial review process to track the progress towards full implementation of all audit findings.” (ACCJC Visiting Team Report)

Further progress was documented in the October 15, 2013 Follow-Up Report submitted to the ACCJC. (District Follow-up Report) The ACCJC accepted the District’s October 15, 2013 follow-up report at its January 2014 meeting, and this recommendation was considered resolved. (ACCJC Letter)
In order to address this recommendation, the District took the following actions:

**Capital Assets and General Obligation Bonds:**
- Policies and procedures to reconcile capital asset expenses in the proper period in accordance with GAAP
  - Implemented additional controls and created a revised format and updated reconciliation procedure
  - *Fully resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.* ([Audit Summary Presentation to Board; Audit Letter, p. 86-89](#))
- Reconciling and reporting bond-funded furniture, fixtures, and equipment
  - Completed three phases (Asset Management, Radio Frequency Identification, Inventory and Asset Tracking)
  - *Fully resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.* ([Audit Summary Presentation to Board; Audit Letter, p. 86-89; 2012-13 Audit, p. 118](#))
- Inadequate controls to reconcile possible conflicts of interest with vendor subcontractors
  - Purchased software for E-filing Form 700 Conflict of Interest
  - *Fully resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.* ([Audit Summary Presentation to Board; Audit Letter, p. 86-89](#))
- Information Technology: Security and Change Management
  - Implemented Mercury Quality Center and Security Weaver and removed Super User Access
  - Moved SAP Basis and Security administrators to Security Weaver for management oversight and reporting
  - Staffed a full time Quality Assurance Analyst and implemented a new Self Service Password reset and SAP USER ID application
  - *Partially resolved as of the 2012-13 Audit.* ([Audit Summary Presentation to Board; Audit Letter, p. 86-89; 2012-13 Audit, p. 118](#)). Full implementation is expected to be confirmed the 2013-14 Audit.

**Federal Findings:**
- Procedures were not in place to ensure proper monitoring of Financial Aid application verifications.
  - Provided internal control procedures and quarterly reports to a quality assurance team
  - *Fully implemented* – expected to be confirmed in the 2013-14 Audit in December 2014
- Files for competitive grants for Worker Placement in High Growth and Emerging Industry Sectors were lost.
  - Deployed a series of document-saving protocols
  - *Fully resolved as of December 2013* ([2012-13 Audit, p. 110](#))

**Ongoing Progress**
The 2012-13 Financial Audit (accepted at the [December 11, 2013 Board meeting](#)) verified that the District is in compliance on all of the financial issues. Only one finding remains, an IT Security and Change Management recommendation that has been partially implemented. ([2012-13 Audit, p. 88](#)) Full implementation is expected to be confirmed in the 2013-14 Audit.

The District has made significant improvements over the past five years, reducing their financial audit findings from five to one, representing an 80% decrease. The District tracks its progress on implementing changes to address all audit findings and continues to conduct this tracking as part of its
ongoing procedures. When there is an audit finding, the District conducts staff training as part of its corrective action plan. (Financial Audit Training Participants85)

District Actions Leading to Resolution of Recommendation 4

At the time of the last self-evaluation report and visit in March 2012, the District was finalizing a thorough review of its budget allocation model. The process had been underway since May 2011, when the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC) began analyzing the District’s budget allocation formula, base allocations, use of ending balance policy, assessments for District Educational Services Center operations, enrollment growth targets, and college deficit repayment policies. After much review and deliberation, the District Budget Committee (DBC) approved the new budget allocation model, which was adopted by the Board on June 13, 2012. (Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism; Board Minutes, p. 6, 06/13/1286)
The resulting model amended the original allocation methods (modeled on SB 361), to one with minimum base funding for colleges. This new budget allocation model was phased in over a three-year period:

- Phase I increased the colleges’ basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs based on square footage. The larger colleges (East L.A. College and Pierce College) have received less revenue, but their reductions were phased in over a three-year period. The smaller colleges benefitted by receiving more revenue in the first year. The new allocation model took into account both size and economy of scale when realigning funding between large colleges and small colleges. Phase I was implemented in the FY 2012-13 budget. (Presentation to BFC, p. 1-287) Annual assessment of the allocation model and evidence of the changes to the maintenance and operations were included in the 2014-15 Final Budget. (Notice of 2014-15 Final Budget, p. 1-1088)
- Phase II called for the ECDBC to study the remaining allocation agenda for potential allocation changes required to provide funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, ensure that colleges are provided with sufficient funding to achieve their missions, and to maintain quality instruction and student services. Phase II components include the following:
  o Growth Formula
  o Review the current use of balance policy
  o Assessments
  o Productivity and Efficiency
  o College Debts and Operating Deficits (Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism89)

The following are some of the activities completed by the District on Phase II:

- **Considered Alternative Growth Funding Proposals.** In the time since the adoption of the new budget allocation model, the ECDBC has studied alternative growth funding formulas in response to Phase II of the formula. The Committee focused on considerations of population density, participation rate, and other factors in determining growth funding allocation. After studying various scenarios, the DBC approved to recommend the following changes in spring 2013 to the Chancellor. These changes were also presented to the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee in September 2013.
  o 80% of available growth funds shall be used to restore college workload reduction until the colleges are fully restored to their pre-reduction workloads
10% of available growth funds shall be distributed to colleges based on each college’s share of the total LACCD underserved population.

10% of available growth funds shall be used to fund colleges based on the State model (DBC Minutes, 4/24/13; DBC Memo to Chancellor; Chancellor Memo to DBC; Presentation to the BFC; BFC Minutes, 9/11/13).

However, in early 2014, work on potential changes to the District’s current growth funding formula was suspended due to the new proposed growth funding formula in the Governor’s 2014-15 Education Budget Trailer Bill. (DBC Minutes, 2/19/14; DBC Memo to Chancellor).

With the completion and implementation of Phase I, changes to the base funding allocation have created a more equitable system for the smaller colleges. The ongoing activities that are part of Phase II will include the ongoing evaluation and continued improvements to the District’s Growth Funding Formula. The District had planned to review the new model after three years (at the end of the FY 2015) to see if the formula is working to address the needs of the smaller colleges. The DBC has already begun conducting an evaluation and is expected to complete it by the end of fall 2014. (DBC Agenda, 8/13/14)

**Approved a Balance and Reserve Policy.**

- On September 5, 2012, the DBC approved changes to the District Balance and Reserve policy as recommended by the ECDBC. (DBC Memo to Chancellor) The Chancellor received and approved the recommendation to maintain the general reserve at 5%; the contingency reserve at 5%; allow colleges to keep their year-end balances up to 5% of their prior fiscal year’s unrestricted general fund budget (excluding prior year balances); and allow colleges to carry over their accumulated balances up to 10% of their prior year’s unrestricted general fund budget. (Chancellor Memo to DBC)

- On August 21, 2013, the DBC requested the Board of Trustees increase the general reserve level to 6.5% and reduce the contingency reserve to 3.5% of unrestricted general revenue for fiscal year 2013-14. The Board of Trustees adopted the 2013-14 Final Budget with these changes. The adjustment to these reserves was based on recent increases and decreases for these respective reserve funds. The combined total for both reserve funds remained at 10% of the overall budget. (2013-14 Final Budget; BFC Minutes, 8/21/13)

**Amended College Debt Repayment Policy.** The DBC recommended that the District amend the College Debt Repayment Policy to do the following: (DBC Minutes August 14, 2013)

- Limit the annual college debt repayment obligation to 3% of the college’s final budget allocation
- Create a policy for giving colleges a method of receiving debt relief upon fulfilling certain conditions
- Suspend debt repayment for one year when a college has a new or interim President to allow him/her time to plan and address the college’s fiscal issues.

The Board of Trustees amended the College Debt Repayment Policy upon recommendation by the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee on December 11, 2013. (DBC memo; Board Agenda, BF4, 12/11/13; Gordon Budget Augmentation Memo)

**Passed New District Financial Accountability Measures to increase Productivity and Efficiency.**

- These ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of colleges within the District. These measures included operating standards, measurement criteria, and consequences/actions for colleges that end their fiscal year in deficit. (District Financial Accountability Measures-Revision#1; Board Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 10/9/13)
The District, along with the Board of Trustees, continues to review the fiscal health of the district and its nine colleges. In August 2014, the Budget and Finance Committee reviewed the proposed Final Budget for 2014-15 with the Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer. This budget included some of the recommendations from Phase II. (Notice of 2014-15 Final Budget; BFC Minutes, 8/6/14)

The District continues to make significant strides towards improving its financial growth formula, balance policies and practices, assessment of financial resources, and college debt policies and practices to ensure colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services.

District Actions Leading to Resolution of Recommendation 5

In 2012, the District implemented a comprehensive Board development program. Training was held in February, April, and November of 2012. Topics included helping Board members distinguish their responsibilities from those of the Chancellor, understand their roles in setting policy, and develop goals and objectives. (Board Minutes: 2/21/12; 4/19/12; 11/13/12)

To institutionalize its commitment to the principles conveyed at its retreats and trainings, the Board revised Board Rule 2300.10 (Code of Ethical Conduct) to include the following language: “I recognize that the Chancellor is the Trustees’ sole employee; I pledge to work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record.”

In addition, the revised language affirms the Trustees’ pledge to avoid involvement in operational matters: “I will participate in the development of policy and the approval of strategy for the District and respect the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institution. I will avoid involvement in day-to-day operations.”

Furthermore, the Board Rule states: “As a Trustee, I will treat others with respect, even in disagreement, and to do my best to earn the respect of others. Being respectful requires civility and courtesy, as well as tolerance for legitimate differences and a willingness to acknowledge that reasonable people can respectfully hold divergent views.” (Board Rule 2300.10 revisions)

As part of the District’s commitment to support and document the use of official channels of communication between the Board and staff, the District instituted a policy on operational procedures and re-activated the use of an internal document tracking form for information requests from Board members. When a Board member requests further information on an issue before, during, or after a meeting, the Assistant Secretary to the Board sends a memo titled “Board Follow-up Items” to the Deputy Chancellor. The Deputy Chancellor then enters it on a form (Response to Board Member Inquiry) and adds it to a tracking document. Responses to inquiries of this nature are sent to the Board as part of a larger package of materials sent every two weeks in the Board packet.

During a Board meeting, as the Board considers matters contained on the Consent Calendar, those items for which Board members require clarification or further information are set aside. The Board President will ask for a vote on the remaining items and then recognize those Board members who require additional information. Once questions have been answered, the Board President will proceed with a vote on each of the items pulled from the Consent Calendar. However, any items requiring further information will be tabled until the information can be provided to the Board members so they can
discuss the issue knowledgeably prior to a vote. Decisions made by the Board are based on full and open discussion of the issues.

In January 2013, the Board also revised Board Rule 2105 to encourage further training: “Within budgetary limits, Trustees shall be encouraged to attend conferences and other educational sessions regarding their responsibilities as Trustees.” (BR 2105 revision102) Additionally, the Board of Trustees completed ethics training from June through October 2013. (Board’s ethics training certificates103)

The Board held a special meeting to discuss an Action Plan for Board Development. This meeting included a presentation on relevant accreditation standards and board policies conducted by Dr. Jerome Hunter of CSU Fullerton and the Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership and a discussion of the Board’s self-evaluation summary report. (Board of Trustees Evaluation: Comparison Report 2012-2013; Board Minutes, 3/19/13104) To guide its future course of action, the Board developed an actionable improvement plan at its annual retreat in spring 2013. (Board Actionable Improvement Plan105)

The Board followed a different process in 2013-14 for its evaluation than in previous years. In October 2013, ACCJC Associate Vice President Dr. John Nixon facilitated a goal-setting workshop to assist the trustees in setting their 2013-14 goals. (Board Goals 2013-14106) He also reviewed Board roles and responsibilities. (Board Minutes, 10/22/13; Accreditation and Trustee Presentation107)

In March 2014, the Board reviewed its goals and discussed achievements during an annual self-assessment session facilitated by external educational consultants Dr. Jose Leyba and Thomas Brown. (Board Minutes, 3/13/14108) As a follow-up to that session, these consultants met with each trustee individually to flesh out the Board’s collective goals as part of the Board’s self-assessment. Trustees’ comments and concerns were compiled, reported in public session, and provided to the incoming Chancellor to ensure continued positive momentum. (Board Self-Evaluation109)

On August 23, 2014, the Board and Chancellor met during a special meeting to discuss the Board’s goals, its committee goals, Board protocols, and the Chancellor’s vision and goals. (Board Retreat Handouts; Board Special Meeting Agenda, 8/23/14110) The Board conducted a self-assessment of its progress in meeting the goals set in Dr. Nixon’s October 2013 workshop. (Report of Board Goal Statements 2013-2014111)
IV. Response to Self-Identified Issues

Harbor College’s 2012 Self Evaluation Study garnered a list of self-identified issues for improvement and development (See Appendix 2). After the 2012 report and visit, all accreditation Standards Teams remained in place, with the addition of some new members. These Standard Teams met from one to three times each semester throughout the 2012-2014 academic years to clarify, review, and in many cases complete the work required to address the issues. As work progressed, Standard Team members clarified the specific targets of many improvement items and identified the individuals or offices that could best achieve the goals. In many instances, as Standard Teams addressed a specific item at hand, they found their work led the College to collaborate on other efforts. For example, addressing Actionable Improvement Item IB7, “Unify institutional effectiveness measurements into the clearest possible assessment of College performance in terms parallel with those utilized by the District for posting on the College website and for use in College governance and planning process,” led to the alignment of strategic goals in the College’s 2015-17 Educational Master Plan with goals in the District Strategic Plan 2012-2017. Standard meetings focused on this action item, along with the College Planning Council retreat, resulted in a collaborative effort that produced amendments to the College’s Policy and Procedures Manual. To address Action Item IIIA, “Update the Faculty and Classified Employee Handbooks to better inform new hires about Harbor College policies and processes,” the Standard Team, together with a workgroup from the Academic Senate, revised the Faculty Handbook. The revised Faculty Handbook was distributed to the campus on Opening Day 2014. Both the Faculty and Classified Handbooks are also more visible and accessible on the campus website.

While all Actionable Improvement Items were addressed and substantive progress achieved, the conclusion was that most items were Achieved (A), In Progress or Continuous (IP/C), or Not Feasible (NF). Progress has been most significant in the areas of cross-campus dialogue and communication between staff, faculty, and administration. All Actionable Improvement items required these constituencies to work closely together towards completion. For a more detailed account of these activities, please see Appendix 2, which lists all of the self-identified issues from the College’s 2012 Self Evaluation Study, along with the responsible individuals and campus constituencies and progress updates as of the fall 2014 semester. The list summarizes the College’s collaborative efforts in identifying, discussing, and moving forward on issues impacting student success.
V. Appendix 1 – List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATD</td>
<td>Achieving the Dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFC</td>
<td>District Budget and Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>Bond Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>College Planning Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTEC</td>
<td>Career Technical Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Distance Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>District Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>District Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHPC</td>
<td>Faculty Hiring Priority Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FON</td>
<td>Faculty Obligation Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalent Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTLA</td>
<td>Faculty Teaching Learning Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYE</td>
<td>First Year Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness System Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLO</td>
<td>Institutional Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACCD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC</td>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Program for Accelerated College Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Service Area Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Scheduling and Recording Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOC</td>
<td>Single Point of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEC</td>
<td>Student Success Evidence Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSP</td>
<td>Student Support and Success Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSU</td>
<td>Student Success Umbrella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Science Technology Engineering Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technology Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VI. Appendix 2 – 2012 Compilation of Self-Identified Issues

### 2012 Compilation of Self-identified Issues

(IP/C) = In Progress/Continuous  (A) = Achieved  (NF) = Not Feasible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Outcome Measurement</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IB3</td>
<td>The college will continue to function as a pilot participant in the development of the District online Institutional Effectiveness System to enable all colleges joining in the system to integrate their SLO/SAO assessments, program review, planning, and budgeting processes as fully as possible.</td>
<td>The placement of program reviews on an IES system linking planning and budgeting.</td>
<td>Deans of Academic Affairs; Deans and Program Managers of student services</td>
<td>In 2013 the LACCD suspended further development of a comprehensive on-line institutional effectiveness system and instead has offered a partial on-line system being installed at Mission College for adaptation by other campuses. Harbor College’s representatives on the District Planning Committee are assessing how this might be implemented at Harbor for 2014-15. (NF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB5</td>
<td>The college will develop a mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of communicating information about institutional quality to the public.</td>
<td>Survey to examine institutional effectiveness.</td>
<td>President’s Office with support from IE</td>
<td>Nine questions regarding institutional effectiveness are included in the 2014 District-wide Student Survey. Results of survey will be available in spring 2015 and will be evaluated in the next accreditation cycle. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB7</td>
<td>Unify institutional effectiveness measurements into the clearest possible assessment of College performance in terms parallel with those utilized by the District for posting on the College website and for use in College governance and planning processes.</td>
<td>&quot;Grid alignment with District Office grid&quot;</td>
<td>IE, DRC, DPC</td>
<td>Strategic goals in the college’s 2015-17 Educational Master Plan are now aligned with District goals. (A) College Planning Council (CPC) Retreat in February 2014 included a survey and evaluation of planning processes and documents. Recommendations from retreat are presented to CPC in fall 2014 for further discussion and possible amendments to Policy and Procedure Manual. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA1a</td>
<td>Further integrate varied data sources (district, college, individual faculty/department managers) to identify and respond to student learning needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Current data collected from SLO’s, SAO’s, PLO’s, ISLO’s will be analyzed and made available on web. Achieving the Dream (ATD) data analysis to identify student populations that require interventions and decrease the equity gap. The college will implement a new assessment intake protocol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>College-wide assessment and evaluation at institutional, program and course levels. Faculty led inquiry group for math retention and success –replaced by the Student Success Umbrella and Student Success Committees. ATD Data Team, ATD Core group, IE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>College participation in ATD (committed to improving student outcomes &amp; use of data to prioritize actions) initiated in March 2011. Data analysis results in three targeted interventions: 1) Front Door to Success Program-Title V First Year Experience (cohorts of 30 students each); Progress represented by this program was scaled up to the Harbor Advantage (250 students) (A) 2) Cultural Equity Awareness (workshops on Financial Literacy, Culture of Poverty, Culturally Responsive Training) (A) 3) Data found that the longer a student stays in the math sequence, the likelier they are to drop out, decreasing overall retention. Developmental Math Strategies to decrease time to progress through math pipeline. (A) Collection of data by the ATD Evidence Committee encourages consistent and integrated use of data for planning. (IP/C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA2a Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Ensure that the College continues to achieve its Student Learning and Service Area Outcome goals on schedule, with each division having 75 percent of course SLOs assessed by the end of the fall 2011 semester; each academic program and pathway having PSLOs assessed by the end of the 2011-12 academic year (that is to say, 25 percent of the total number of PSLOs then being complete); assessment for two ILSOs conducted by the end of that academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Completed assessment forms posted on the web; evidence of SLO outcomes integrated into program reviews and college planning. All assessments completed by Fall 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>VP’s, Deans, and Faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Division Chairs ensure the division-wide reporting and discussion of SLO assessment outcomes. (IP/C) Discussion/analysis of ISLO, PLO, and SLO assessments ongoing at department, division, and institutional levels. Increased standardization of SLO data- use of department-wide essay grading rubrics and the implementation of standardized and more authentic means of assessment (i.e., standardized essay questions). (IP/C) Creation of assessment template embedded in division meeting and Cluster meeting agendas and posted along with division minutes. Template provides structure for dialogue &amp; more specific outcomes for SLO/SAO actions. (IP/C) Improved SLO &amp; SAO completion accomplished by training workshops, and individual meetings with SLO coordinator and Deans. Flex activities created to discuss assessment results. (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### IIB1 Improvement Plan

**Realignment created to ensure a systematic cycle of SLO’s, PLO’s and ISLO’s assessed.** *(A)*

Dialogue about the possibility of organizing an SLO/SAO reporting day in conjunction with a mandatory Flex day. Gathering entire college body could insure higher completion rate and stimulate dialogue. *(A)*

Pursue logistics of automatic updates for assessment reporting. *(IP/C)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measurement</th>
<th>Use and implementation of SIS system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Deans of Academic Affairs; Deans and Program Managers of student services; Dean of IE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Updates             | Harbor administrators worked on initial review of system vendors. *(A)*
|                     | LACCD actively recruited individuals to serve on SIS- two persons/area. SIS user-groups (every area impacted) mapping processes to ensure all needs captured. *(A)*
|                     | FitGap analysis sessions (workshops) by area. Ensuring that all needs are addressed within the SIS before going live. Pilot one aspect in fall 2014; ongoing pilots, full LAHC migration to be completed 2016. *(IP/C)* |

### IIB1 Improvement Plan

Monitor any changes in regulations and policies by the federal, state and District offices, and will implement policies as required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measurement</th>
<th>Regular communication of new policies or regulations to campus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Deans and Program Managers of Student Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Updates             | Student Services staff (SSSP, DSPS, Financial Aid, Counseling) serve on Chancellor’s taskforces to examine policy issues (DSPS, fee waivers, funding model) provide input on policy development and implementation. *(IP/C)*
|                     | Ongoing attendance by staff at state and district-wide training conferences/group meeting, community regional groups and providing on-campus professional and development training. *(IP/C)*
|                     | Full implementation of Student Success Initiative (SB-1456) along with re-evaluation/update of Board Rules, district/local policy change and cross-campus communication and collaboration of SSSP and Student Equity Plans-2014-2015. *(A)* |

### IIB1 Improvement Plan

Determine level of staffing needs for certificated, classified, and unclassified staffing in order to meet student needs as identified in Student Services evaluative efforts, and program review and unit plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measurement</th>
<th>Cluster plan for Student Services; Human Resources Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>VPs, Deans, Program Managers, Human Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Ongoing evaluation, revisions/updates of SS program review, Unit/Cluster plans. <em>(IP/C)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Program reviews and unit plans (2010-2016) completed with identification of staffing needs within Human Resources Plan. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Ensure that all Student Services units identify student/service learning outcomes, measure outcomes, and integrate data into planning decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Completed assessment forms are posted on the college website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Student Services Program Managers and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of SAOs completed on schedule; Data use is reflected in required annual program areas plans provided to Chancellor’s Office. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of unit plans at monthly Student Services Cluster meetings after discussion in bi-weekly manager’s meeting and individual program area team meetings. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of template identifying program SAOs, their assessment, and changes implemented; stronger SAO dialogue; use of data/outcomes reflected in annual program plan (budget) and narrative reports submitted annually to Chancellor’s Office and final expenditure report at year-end closeout. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Implement a web-based interactive counseling system for students and expand student website services through social media with close adherence to federal accessibility standards (Section 508).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Point-of-service and student surveys to evaluate effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Dean, Program Area Managers, DSPS, SSSP, and Counseling Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Web-based interactive counseling piloted through assessment center, fully implemented fall 2013. Online counseling appointments and Questions on line. Tracked through SARS; Scheduling system used in 90% of program service areas; Financial Aid and Admission processes completely online- working to develop class add function; closing the communications loop with Early Alert system faculty referral to Dean/Assessment Center faculty/staff; point-of-service, student surveys utilized. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of Student Services web committee to improve accessibility of all online services. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web-based service for job placement- College Central Network- allows students to tap into employer needs and to connect with LAHC alumni. Contract process ongoing. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New student e-mail system implemented. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Provide appropriate adaptive computer technology and alternate media to meet the accessibility needs of the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Sign in logs; DSPS tutor reports; surveys on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>DSPS Program Coordinator, with I.T. support and input from LRC/LAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>High Tech Center for Students with Disabilities monitors student need and accessibility. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Increase the number of students who have identified a formal education plan from our current 47% to 60%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>SARS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Counselors and Deans/Program Managers of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Implementation of SB 1456 mandates orientation (streamlined), assessment, counseling, declaration of major/pathway and creation of student education plan (initial abbreviated plan with comprehensive plan at completion of 15 units); follow-up for at-risk students through early alert and other appropriate interventions. (A) First Year Experience and Title V orientation and creation of education plan. (A) Harbor Advantage program facilitates outreach and identification of education plan by maximum number of students. As of April 2014 completed assessment of 715 new incoming students as compared to 303 students at same time last year. Data collected through SARS, DEC/Focus Reports. (A) Follow-up services for at-risk students (SAP); new retention counselor; group counseling sessions for financial aid. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB3c Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Expand the development and dissemination of marketing materials to international as well as underserved populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Categoricals, veterans, CalWorks, etc. designated programs will measure inquiry and enrollment numbers. International students will also be measured in inquiries/enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>International Students Director; Recruitment and Outreach Coordinator; Assoc. Dean of EOPS/Categorical Program Managers/ Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Recruitment at all levels scaled back due to budgetary restraints. 2012; new influx of funding through the Governor’s budget and implementation of SB 1456 has enhanced outreach efforts 2013-14. (A) Student Services Program areas (EOPS, DSPS, Foster Youth), gathers data on unserved/underserved populations. Key to success is coordination, collaboration and leveraging of funding resources in each area. (IP/C) Creation of more informational website to reach international students; tracking of hits on international site; district attempting to create district-wide international website. Marketing programs through social media, college fairs, high school visits, and campus tours. (IP/C) Creation of brochures for transfer degree. Expanded partnerships in community-DCS- Foster Youths. (A) Youth Source Center Grant July 1, 2012 -collaboration and partnership between EWD/Student Services in supporting dropout prevention/student recovery program with City of L.A/feeder high schools. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC1 Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Identify specific areas for assessment and develop a measurement device to track student performance and link to Library/LRC usage campus-wide associated with student success (transfer, AA, or certificate/honors students at culmination).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Define parameters and determine a methodology. Closer coordination with faculty-determined research assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Library faculty with support from IT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Updates

Pre and post-tests after library workshops for assessment of ISLO # 3 Information Competency. (A)

Continuous assessment every fall semester; early assessment data informs adjustments to workshop focus - shift away from technical training to focus on general research skills. (IP/C)

Student Survey in place to assess student perceptions of tutorial and information services. (A)

Tracking of lab, reference desk, and circulation desk usage. (IP/C)

Pilot program, fall 2014, to provide workshops on two key areas: locating resources and building a bibliography. Five classes (two English, Psychology, Speech, History) participating. Library workshops providing stronger alignment between research and course materials. Pilot assessing student knowledge of sources and effective use of documented material. (IP/C)

Establish correlation between the uses of library resources to student success; embed a program to track participating class sections and/or student ID numbers and link to completion and grades. (IP/C)

LRC providing generic skills courses-use of Etudes and turnitin.com. Information competence workshops provided in new facility. (A)

Self-assessment form-writing lab – ongoing bi-annually. Assessment in LRC TBD. (IP/C)

GUIDE-ON-THE-SIDE from ASU (free software) needs Linux expertise for installation. In progress, Fall 2014 semester. Allows for interactive instruction; distance education students can get non-credit instruction. (A)

### Improvement Plan

**IIC1c**

Post available student support programs on specific division and student services Web pages to provide greater publicity and support for all available learning assistance resources regardless of discipline or location.

Every division have a link to the library and LRC on their department website

Department Chairs and Program Managers

Web site redesigned with student support services all at one site. (A)

A link to be placed on Etudes site to link to library and learning resource website. Coordinate with Distance Education Committee. (NF)

Grid documenting availability of tutoring resources posted on web; updated every semester. (IP/C)

Expand on campus orientation to include visits to or presentations by the Library and Learning Resource Center staff.

Log high school visits and ensure Library/LAC are on the tour.

Dean of Enrollment Management, Recruitment Coordinator

FYE coordinates with library (library workshops and dedicated librarian), completed in Fall 2013. (A)

Coordinate with counselors for special programs and Harbor Advantage to request orientation for library and learning resources ("Transfer 101" workshops – in development). (IP/C)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIIC1e</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Improve tracking of database usage in order to strengthen the link between data and planning and to better inform future planning decisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Develop the tools required to track data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Chair of Library; Chair of LRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Revise database packages- tracking usage statistics of the data bases, yearly. Data base usage determines what is purchased. Determines allocation to databases for upcoming year. (IP/C) Prop. 20 monies have supplied much needed support for library. Ongoing need to maintain consistent funding for library; ensure that administrative and Senate support for library is reflected in actual budget allocations. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIIA 1a</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Ensure that all hiring requests are documented within the College plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Update the Human Resources Plan to facilitate achievement of objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Senior Staff, President, FHPC, CPC Human Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Human Resources Plan, (includes data from Program Review what positions are needed/planned, creation of rubric for classified positions to prioritize staffing needs) approved CPC, 2-13-13. (A) Request for Position Form created and posted on web. Form utilized for all hires. (A) Yearly update of Human Resource Plan underway+ manual revisions. Evaluation of previous manual conducted at CPC Retreat. 2-25-14 (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIIA 3b</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Clarify confidentiality regulations in each department and ensure the confidentiality of work-related issues is on a need-to-know basis between the employees and direct supervisors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Training workshops for all Department Chairs, managers/supervisors, Deans, Vice Presidents, and college President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>SPOC and Flex/Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Human Resources workshop on confidentiality–Flex activity 2-13-13 (A) New faculty orientation includes presentation/discussion on confidentiality - 2-25-14 (A) LACCD notified Human Resources of district-wide effort to educate colleges on confidentiality issues. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIIA 4c</th>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Update the Faculty and Classified Employee Handbooks to better inform new hires about Harbor College policies and processes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Handbooks updated and available on the website. Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>SPOC/District Office HR, Academic Senate, CPC, Collective Bargaining agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Institute a preventive and predictive maintenance program to prolong the life of building systems and to identify and assess current and future repair needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Integrate college and district tools required to track data of preventive, predictive, scheduled maintenance, and operational work requests of campus needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>FMO Manager, VP Administrative Services, and AdmServices Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Programs exist, however limited resources dictate addressing immediate actions/needs as opposed to long term planning. (NF) Ongoing maintenance challenged by new facilities coming online and campus operational needs (special events, graduation, visits, etc.). (IP/C) Need for college to follow policies and plans for facilities needs and requests (i.e. keys, event setups, moves, special requests, etc.). (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Further integrate facilities planning in all of its aspects to reflect both the Educational Master Plan and the completion of bond construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Planning Retreat to facilitate communication; and schedule each Cluster planning retreat to accomplish shared goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>VPs of the Clusters, CPC, Senate, IE for support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>Reorganization of CORE Committee (developed for bond management and coordination with campus operations) to provide better communication and transparency on facility issues. (A) Presentation of Facilities Plan in CPC to provide information for unit and cluster planning. (A) Add bond and construction related items to the CPC as standing report presented by FMO Director. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Clarify and advertise the technology options to students, such as the process of obtaining a student LACCD email address, and publicize the benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Measurement</td>
<td>Measured and reported by IT that students have increased in number/usage of accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>IT staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Updates | Student e-mail accounts became the official college-wide means of communication 5-1-13 (A)  
Publication in the hands of Student Services, Admissions of Records. Pin number for e-mail same as Pin for registering for classes. E-mail will exist for 2 terms. Must enroll in classes. After two terms Reminders will be sent, after two terms account is gone. Office 365 available -25 gigs Sky Drive. (IP/C)  
Need for short instructions to inform students and instruct how to use the Student Services online orientation. Post on marquee, flyer. (IP/C)  
Include technology training within Harbor Advantage orientation. (IP/C) |
| --- | --- |
| IIC 1a Improvement Plan | Establish the role of TAC (Technology Advisory Committee) as a ‘clearance’ committee in the college planning process, guaranteeing that IT-related planning and budget decisions made by planning committees are properly informed and coordinated.  
Outcome Measurement | Enforce the use of a form (referred to in the Planning Manual) to be signed off on by TAC and attached to all Unit Plans with Technology based requirements. If the signed form is absent, the activity/objective will be taken off of the Unit/Cluster plans. IT will assist in the design of the form.  
Who | TAC, Division Chairs, Deans/Program managers, VPs, IT support  
Updates | Regular monthly meetings of TAC (IP/C)  
TAC will design form to be used in clearance process. Form will be attached to unit plans and formalize role of TAC as clearance committee. (A) |
| IIC 1b Improvement Plan | Ensure that there are technical resource training workshops that are relevant and applicable to specific disciplines and classrooms offered during the first week of FLEX activities and throughout the school year.  
Outcome Measurement | Perform a needs assessment to determine training needs; Track Flex and Teaching Learning Center offerings  
Who | Flex Coordinator, TLC Faculty, Dean of Academic Affairs  
Updates | Flex activity for use of Outlook held in June 2013; inclusion of instructions for faculty to then give to students regarding use of new student e-mail accounts. (A)  
Universal use (District-wide) of LACCD student email accounts, Fall 2013. Includes one TB of online storage, Office 365. (A)  
TLC calendar (minimum of two workshops – one from TLC faculty, one from non-TLC faculty) of activities provides faculty technology training. Special topics presented in fall and spring as Flex activities. Participation in FTLA workshops. Approximately 6 workshops per year. (A)  
Departmental Etudes student trainings; specific departmental student trainings to prepare for classes. (A)  
Creation of limited administrative access for individuals to assist IT in classroom technology updates. Training for these individuals provided. (A) |
| IIC 2 Improvement Plan | Outline a systematic campus wide refresh policy for technology that is built into the campus budget.  
Outcome Measurement | Integrate the policy into the Administrative Cluster plan; align budget to achieve objective. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Outcome Measurement</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIIC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT staff, VP Administrative Services, AdmServices Committee</td>
<td>Refresh policy discussed in TAC. No funding exists for policy - Spring 2013. (NF) Yearly budgeting document created for current/projected future cost of instructional technology. Submitted to district followed by state. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIID</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of Economic &amp; Workforce Devmt., VP Academic Affairs, Division Chairs</td>
<td>Grants administration has been consolidated under a single Dean. (A) All grants were reviewed and an assessment of release time was conducted. Faculty who are working on grant activities are now paid as extra assignments or stipends for work that meets grant objectives. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIID 2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget Committee; VP Administrative Services</td>
<td>Budget website consistently updated to reflect current budget status. (A) Budget org chart adopted by CPC in 2012 posted on website along with monthly budget projection summary. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIID 2d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget Committee; VP Administrative Services</td>
<td>Develop a process to give the Committee the operative capacity to ensure that expenditures made are actually authorized as well as properly processed in the technical sense. Create a flow diagram outlining the process. Budget process delineated within overall college planning flow chart. (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication of information dependent upon regular and informative meetings of Administrative Services Cluster and Budget Committee. Regular meetings of both have been resumed. *(IP/C)*

The major purpose of monthly manager’s meetings would be to communicate and urge compliance with spending limits; role of Budget Committee as enforcement mechanism independent of cluster involved. *(IP/C)*

Insure that approval form adopted by CPC to confirm expenditures presented to the college President for approval have been authorized through the formal planning and budget process. *(IP/C)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Outcome Measurement</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IIID 2d</strong></td>
<td>Fully Report CTE decisions to the Budget Committee so cost overruns that then must be charged against the general fund can be minimized. In seeing to this, the responsibilities of the Dean of Economic and Workforce Development must be clarified according to the Grants Policy and Procedures Manual as part of the over-all planning process.</td>
<td>Grants Committee; CTEC Committee; Budget Committee</td>
<td>Upon review of this item it was found that there have been no cost overruns on any CTE grants. <em>(IP/C)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine and revise the Grants Policy &amp; Procedure manual as needed to ensure fiscal responsibility of grant management is achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IIID 2e</strong></td>
<td>Procure funding for the position of a full-time Foundation director on a permanent basis.</td>
<td>Hire an Executive Director for the Foundation on a permanent basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IVA 2a</strong></td>
<td>Governance and planning bodies will complete their “action-evaluation loops” for the 2011-12 academic year by adapting the evaluation model initiated by the District Planning Committee in 2009.</td>
<td>Implement the model, completing all needed documentation; posting results on website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment, Grants, FHPC, CTE, CPC completed self-evaluation forms; submitted to the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. Evaluation template posted on web to promote broader use by all committees. <em>(A)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IVA1</strong></td>
<td>The CPC will conduct a “communication audit” to pinpoint where aspects of the process have broken down and to propose solutions for Council action.</td>
<td>All participants in the governance and planning process will be surveyed in detail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Updates**  
Survey conducted after CPC Planning Retreat in February, 2014. Results of evaluation systematically discussed throughout CPC meetings. Changes to be implemented within next planning cycle. (IP/C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Outcome Measurement</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVA3</td>
<td>Hold committee meetings to the shortest time possible.</td>
<td>Committee Chairs</td>
<td>Use of committee reporting template attached to meeting agendas. Standardized form provides focused reporting and reduces reporting time. (IP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA4</td>
<td>All constituency representatives on the CPC will affirm the final document on a separate signature page to strengthen its credibility.</td>
<td>Signing the document at a CPC meeting; posting it on the website.</td>
<td>Signing procedures have been formalized with campus constituencies. (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Who**  
CPC; Academic Senate

**Who**  
CPC; Academic Senate; Administration; Classified staff; Students.
VII. Appendix 3 – Evidence

1. Accreditation meeting attendance sheets:
   http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/FN1-ACC%20Attendance%20sheets.%20Fall%202014.pdf
2. Opening Day presentation:
3. 2013 Follow-Up Report to ACCJC, July 3, 2013:
   http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/accreditation/followup2013.html
5. Program Reviews:
   http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/collegeplans/programreview2011.html
   Unit Plans:
   http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/collegeplans/unitplans.html
6. Budget Committee Minutes:
   http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/budget/minutes.html
7. Cluster Plans:
   http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/collegeplans/unitplans.html:
   Annual College Plan:
8. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment:
   http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/slo/index.html
9. History Discipline Minutes:
10. Anthropology Discipline Minutes:
11. Political Science Assessment:
    http://www.lahc.edu/slo/politicalsciAssessment.html
    Sociology Assessment:
    http://www.lahc.edu/slo/SociologyAssessment.html
12. Student Services Cluster Committee Minutes:
    http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/studentservices/minutes.html
13. Institutional SLO Assessment:
    http://www.lahc.edu/slo/institutionalassessment/islo.html
14. Institutional SLO Assessment:
    http://www.lahc.edu/slo/institutionalassessment/islo.html
15. ISLO #3 Assessment Results:
16. Social and Behavioral Sciences Minutes:
17. Student Success Minutes:
    http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/success/ssecminutes.html
18. Student Success Umbrella Committee Minutes:
    http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/success/minutes.html
19. Student focus group presentation:
    http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/atd/Data%20and%20Supportive%20Research%20Links.html
20. FYE Course Retention & Completion:
    http://www.lahc.edu/accreditation/institutionaleffectiveness/ATD_and_equity_projects_reports/FYE%20Fa12%20Cohort%20Retention%20and%20Completion%20Revised.pdf
21 CPC Minutes 3/10/14:  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/cpc/cpc%20minutes%203-10-14.pdf

22 Student Success Plan:  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/LAHC_SSSP1.pdf;  
Student Equity Plan:  

23 Math Follow Up Survey:  
Math Placements:  
http://www.lahc.edu/accreditation/institutionaleffectiveness/ATD_and_equity_projects_reports/Math%20Placements%20Spring%202014.pdf

24 Math & Technology Unit Plan:  

25 Student Equity Plan:  

26 CPC Minutes, November 10, 2014:  

27 Faculty Handbook:  

28 College Functional Plans:  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/planning.html

29 Shared Governance Calendar:  
http://www.lahc.edu/sharedgovernancecalendar.html

30 How We Plan:  

31 FHPC Rubric:  

32 Human Resources Plan:  

33 Planning Evaluation Comprehensive Report:  

34 CPC minutes, September 22, 2014:  
CPC Minutes, October 13, 2014:  

35 Assessment Evaluation:  
http://www.lahc.edu/slo/Evaluation%20of%20the%20Assessment%20Process%20July%202014.pdf

36 Budget Committee Minutes:  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/budget/minutes.html

37 Budget documents – Position Request Form 2014:  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/FN30-Position%20Request%20Form%202014.pdf;  
Request to Hire or Extend an Assignment 2014:  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/FN30-Request%20To%20Hire%20or%20Extend%20an%20Assignment%202014.pdf

38 Grants Committee:  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/grant_committee/index.html

39 President’s Updates:  
https://www.lahc.edu/ottolee.html

40 Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC):  
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/senate/fhpc/index.html
41 Human Resources Plan:

42 LACCD Budget:

43 ACCJC letter, February 7, 2014:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/ACCJC%20Letter%20to%20District%20Office_2-7-2014.pdf

44 Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, Com. BF4, June 13, 2012:
Board Minutes, Com. BF4, p. 6, June 13, 2012:

45 Board Special Meeting Minutes, February, 21, 2012:
Board Special Meeting Minutes, April 19, 2012:
Board Special Meeting Minutes, November 13, 2012:

46 Independent Review Panel Report, January 4, 2012:

47 District Special Report, April 1, 2013:

48 ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2, 2013:

49 ACCJC letter July 3, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/ACCJC%20Action%20Letter%20July%203%202013%20to%20all%20colleges%20and%20DO.pdf

50 District Follow-Up Report, October 15, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/LACCD%20Follow%20Up%20Report%20October%2015%202013.pdf

51 Board Agenda, August 21, 2013, p. 59 & 61:
Board Minutes, August 21, 2013:

52 RFP for Bond Program Monitor, September 16, 2013:

53 LACCD CPM KPIs, May 31, 2014:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/LACCD%20CPM%20KPIs-May.31.2014.pdf

54 Risk Overview Facilities Director’s Report, July 10, 2014:

55 FMP&OC Minutes, April 30, 2014:
Change Order Memorandum June 16, 2014:

56 AECOM Districtwide Energy Program Overview, August 20, 2014:

57 FMP&OC Agenda, June 25, 2014:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/FMPOCmtgagenda-6.25.2014.pdf;
College Budget Recovery Plan presentation, June 17, 2014:

58 Board Agenda, p. 39, August 6, 2014:
Board Minutes, p. 5, August 6, 2014:
Web Enabled SOPs, August 22, 2014:

Board Rule 17002 and 17004 Revisions, September 11, 2013:

AECOM Districtwide Energy Program Overview, August 20, 2014:

AECOM Facilities Lifecycle Review, May 28, 2014:

Custodial Services Enhancement Program, July 23, 2014:

Color of Money:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Color%20of%20Money%20trainingPresentation-8.2014.pdf;
Cost Principles:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Cost%20Principles%20Training%202014.pdf;
Program Labor Log Training Presentations, August 2014:

Conflict of Interest Training Presentation, July 2013:

Chancellor Directive 152, April 26, 2012:

Form 700 Memo from Goulet, November 4, 2014:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Form700MemofromGoulet-11.4.2014.pdf

Updated Conflict of Interest Flowchart, Winter 2014:

Legal Crash Course presentation, July 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/LegalCrashCourse-July2013.pdf

Board’s ethics training certificates, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Ethics%20certificates%20ALL.pdf

FMP&OC Minutes, August 21, 2013:
FMP&OC Minutes, November 20, 2013:
FMP&OC Minutes, February 26, 2014:
FMP&OC Minutes, June 16, 2014:

FMP&OC Minutes, June 25, 2014:

Bond Steering Committee Strategic Execution Plans Report, July 18, 2014:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Strategic%20Execution%20Plan%20Presentation%20to%20BSC.pdf

District Special Report, April 1, 2013:

ACCJC Visiting Team Report, May 2013:

District Follow-up Report, October 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/LACCD%20Follow%20Up%20Report%20October%202013.pdf

ACCJC letter, February 7, 2013:

KPMG 2012-2013 Audit Summary Presentation to Board, December 4, 2013:
2012-13 KPMG Audit Letter, p. 86-89, December 11, 2013:
79 KPMG 2012-13 Audit Summary Presentation to Board, December 4, 2013:
2012-13 KPMG Audit Letter, p. 86-89, December 11, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/2012-2013KPMGAuditletter-p86-89.pdf;
2012-13 Audit, p. 118, December 11, 2013:

80 KPMG 2012-13 Audit Summary Presentation to Board, December 4, 2013:
2012-13 KPMG Audit Letter, p. 86-89, December 11, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/2012-2013KPMGAuditletter-p86-89.pdf

81 KPMG 2012-13 Audit Summary Presentation to Board, December 4, 2013:
2012-13 KPMG Audit Letter, p. 86-89, December 11, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/2012-2013KPMGAuditletter-p86-89.pdf

82 2012-13 Audit, p. 110, December 2013:

83 December 11, 2013 Board meeting:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/20131211-Board-Minutes.pdf

84 2012-13 Audit, p. 88, December 2013:

85 Financial Audit Training Participants, July 2013:

86 Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, Com. BF4, June 13, 2012:
Board Minutes, Com. BF4, p. 6, June 13, 2012:

87 Growth Funding Model Proposal Presentation to Budget and Finance Committee, p. 1-2, August 21, 2013:

88 Notice of 2014-15 Final Budget, p. 1-10, August 6, 2014:

89 Amendment to Budget Allocation Mechanism, Com BF4, p. 5, June 13, 2012:

90 DBC Minutes, April 24, 2013:
DBC Memo to Chancellor, May 6, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/DBCMemotoChancellor-5.6.2013.pdf;
Chancellor Memo to DBC, May 24, 2013:
Growth Funding Model Proposal Presentation to the BFC, August 21, 2013:
Budget and Finance Committee Meeting Minutes, September 11, 2013:

91 DBC Minutes, February 19, 2014:
DBC Memo to Chancellor, February 26, 2014:

92 DBC Agenda, August 13, 2014:

93 DBC Memo to Chancellor, September 10, 2012:
94 Chancellor Memo to DBC, September 26, 2012:

95 2013-14 Final Budget, August 21, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/2013-14FinalBudget.pdf
Budget and Finance Committee Minutes, August 21, 2013:

96 DBC Minutes August 14, 2013:

97 DBC memo, August 26, 2013:

98 District Financial Accountability Measures-Revision#1, September 19, 2013:

99 Notice of 2014-15 Final Budget, August 6, 2014:
Budget & Finance Committee Meeting Minutes, August 6, 2014:

100 Board Special Meeting Minutes, February, 21, 2012:
Board Special Meeting Minutes, April 19, 2012:
Board Special Meeting Minutes, November 13, 2012:

101 Board Rule 2300.10 revisions, January 30, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Ch.II-ArticleIII.Board%20Rule%202300.10.pdf

102 BR 2105 revision, January 16, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Ch.II-ArticleIV.BoardRule%202105.pdf

103 Board’s ethics training certificates, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Ethics%20certificates%20ALL.pdf

104 Board of Trustees Evaluation: Comparison Report 2012-2013, February 2013:
Board Special Meeting Minutes, March 19, 2013:

105 Board Actionable Improvement Plan, March 19, 2013:

106 Board Goals 2013-14, October 22, 2013:
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/Board%20Goals%202013-14_10.22.13.pdf

107 Board Special Meeting Minutes, October 22, 2013:
Accreditation and Trustee Presentation, October 22, 2013:

108 Board Special Meeting Minutes, March 13, 2014:
Board Self-Evaluation, May 28, 2014:

Board Retreat Handouts, August 23, 2014:

Board Special Meeting Agenda, August 23, 2014:

Report of Board Goal Statements 2013-2014, August 28, 2014: