

# **EVALUATION REPORT**

## **LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE**

1111 Figueroa Place  
Wilmington, CA 90744-2397

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

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited Los Angeles Harbor  
College from March 12-15, 2012

Terrence J. Burgess, Ph.D., Chair

Los Angeles Harbor College  
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster

Dr. Terrence J. Burgess (**Chair**)  
President  
San Diego City College  
1313 Park Boulevard  
San Diego CA 92101-4787

Ms. Lydia D. Gonzales (**Assistant**)  
Administrative Secretary to the Vice  
President of Instruction  
San Diego City College  
1313 Park Boulevard  
San Diego CA 92101-4787

Ms. MaryBeth Benvenuti\*  
Business Manager  
College of Alameda  
c/o 1593 Ashwood Drive  
Martinez, CA 94553

Dr. Stephen Johnson\*  
Vice President Student Services  
Cerritos College  
11110 Alondra Blvd  
Norwalk CA 90650

Dr. Joseph Carrithers  
Professor of English  
Fullerton College  
321 E. Chapman Ave  
Fullerton CA 92832

Ms. Susan Lamb  
Vice President Academic Affairs  
Diablo Valley College  
c/o 529 Balra Drive  
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Mr. William Craft  
Dean of Learning Resources and  
Technology  
San Diego Mesa College  
7250 Mesa College Drive  
San Diego, CA 92111-4998

Dr. Tammi Marshall\*  
Math Instructor, Co-Chair Accreditation  
Cuyamaca College  
900 Rancho San Diego Pkwy  
El Cajon CA 92019

Dr. Deborah DiThomas\*  
Interim President  
Norco College  
2001 Third Street  
Norco CA 92860

Ms. Barbara McNeice-Stallard  
Director, Research & Institutional  
Effectiveness  
Mt. San Antonio College  
1100 N. Grand Ave  
Walnut CA 91789

Mr. Edwin Hiel, Trustee\*  
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community  
College District  
8800 Grossmont College Drive  
El Cajon, CA 92020-1799

Dr. Lisa Miller\*  
Dean of Student Learning  
Moorpark College  
7075 Campus Road  
Moorpark CA 93021

\*first-time member.

## SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

**Institution:** Los Angeles Harbor College

**Date of Visit:** March 12-15, 2012

**Team Chair:** Terrence J. Burgess, Ph.D.  
President, San Diego City College

An eleven-member accreditation team, augmented with a team assistant, visited Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) from March 12-15, 2012. The purposes of the visit were to determine whether the institution continues to meet accreditation standards, to evaluate how well the college is achieving its stated purposes, to provide recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and to submit recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended an all-day chair training session on December 6, 2011 and the chair and team members attended an all-day team training session on February 3, 2012 conducted by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC, ACCJC). Team members reviewed the Commission's *Guide to Evaluating Institutions*, the *Accreditation Reference Handbook*, the *Team Evaluator Manual*, and the *Distance Learning Manual*, as well as the college's *Self-Evaluation Report* and related evidentiary documents provided by LAHC. In addition, team members carefully reviewed the team report prepared by the 2006 visiting accreditation team, progress report from 2008, follow-up report from 2008, limited visit report from 2008, follow-up report from 2009, midterm report from 2009, substantive change proposal from 2009, follow-up report from 2010, and annual reports from 2007 through 2011. The team chair and assistant conducted a pre-visit meeting with the college president and executive administrators on February 6, 2012 to outline the expectations of the visiting team and to assure that all appropriate arrangements and accommodations would be in order.

The team members were divided into four sub-groups according to the four accreditation standards. For each accreditation standard, one team member was designated Lead Member for coordinating purposes. Two weeks prior to the visit, each team member prepared detailed reports of their review of the entire Self-Evaluation Report and the particular accreditation standard to which they had been assigned. Team members also identified individuals with whom they desired to meet while on campus, and this information was conveyed to the college. On March 12, 2012, the Chair and four Lead Members met with members of the district administration, district academic senate president, and Board of Trustees representatives. Also on March 12, 2012, the entire team met to collectively review the Self-Evaluation Report and to outline evidence to be reviewed during the ensuing team visit.

During the three-day visit, the team met either individually or in groups with over one hundred college faculty, staff, students, administrators, and governing board members. In addition, team members held three well-attended sessions open to all members of the college community. The team reviewed hundreds of documents, toured a wide variety of instructional and student support

facilities, visited dozens of classes, examined on-line instruction, and observed the operation of instructional and student support programs throughout the institution.

In general, the Self-Evaluation Report was thorough and well-organized. The document contained an Abstract referencing each of the accreditation standards and the college's responses to them; an Introduction outlining the organization of the Self-Evaluation Report, the involvement of college constituencies in its development, and college organizational charts; Background and Demographics including a brief history and descriptive background of the institution and its curriculum, student and community demographics, and significant institutional changes and challenges that have ensued since the last comprehensive evaluation in 2006; Certification of the 21 Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation and Certification of continued institutional compliance with Accrediting Commission policies; Responses to Previous Recommendations made by the comprehensive evaluation team in 2006 and a Commission Recommendation made in 2008; and detailed descriptive summary, self-evaluation, and planning agenda (Actionable Improvement Plan) for each of the four accreditation standards. The team noted that the Self-Evaluation Report was a candid assessment of the institution and was extremely useful to team members in their institutional review.

The college provided a generally complete and well-organized set of evidentiary documents cited in the Self-Evaluation Report. However, some of the cited evidence was found to be difficult to locate both electronically and in the evidence files, and a number of electronic links did not yield the cited information.

College personnel both were readily available for interview and candid in their responses to team members' questions. The faculty was extremely accommodating to the team in allowing classroom observation.

In a number of cases within the Self-Evaluation Report, Descriptive Summaries were fully explicated, but no Self-Evaluations were provided.

Lastly, the college's Actionable Improvement Plan appears both reasonable and significant in importance to the institution. We did note, however, that in a number of the standards discussed in the Self-Evaluation Report, the college's self-assessment identified important activities to be undertaken in the future, but these were not included in the Actionable Improvement Plan.

Nevertheless, we have every confidence that LAHC will actualize its improvement plan within the next accreditation cycle to the ultimate benefit of students and the institution.

## **Introduction and Summary**

Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) was established in 1949 as two-year technical institute with an initial enrollment of 649 students. Today, it is one of nine accredited and comprehensive community colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). LAHC received a reaffirmation of its accreditation by ACCJC in 2006, following a comprehensive visit by an accreditation team and subsequent action by the accrediting commission. In addition to a required midterm report in 2009, the college was directed to prepare a series of progress and

follow-up reports between 2008 and 2010, and to host a limited visit by Commission representatives in 2008.

An eleven-member team, appointed by ACCJC, conducted a Comprehensive Evaluation of LAHC from March 12-15, 2012. Team members visited classes; interviewed a broad representation of the college community, including students, faculty, staff, and administrators; held three open community forums; attended a number of campus meetings; met with the district chancellor, vice chancellors and other district administrators, and representatives of the Board of Trustees; and toured both campus facilities and programs of the college in order to acquire a thorough understanding of LAHC's instructional programs, support services for students, organizational culture and climate, and student population.

The purposes of the evaluation were to review evidence in support of assertions of the college, as detailed in the Self-Evaluation Report, that the institution meets or exceeds the four standards of accreditation for a comprehensive community college, to determine how well the college had addressed the recommendations of the previous visiting team, to provide recommendations regarding quality assurance and institutional improvement so as to assist the college in strengthening its programs and services, and to enable the team to make a founded recommendation to the accrediting commission regarding the accredited status of LAHC.

One of the college's greatest strengths is its spirit of community. The team was impressed by the enthusiasm and genuine excitement of students, faculty, staff, and administrators to be a part of the institution and to contribute to its success. College personnel were friendly, engaging, helpful, and cooperative in the many interactions team members experienced. Students were satisfied with their college experience and felt that the institution was committed to their academic success and the accomplishment of their academic goals.

LAHC has grown substantially since its last accreditation visit. Throughout this period, the institution has planned and implemented many innovative and effective instructional and student support service programs, engaged in facility planning and construction, and hired many new faculty, staff, and administrators. During these changes, the college has initiated significant dialogue around its mission and purpose, engaged the institutional stakeholders in an inclusive and effective model of shared governance, and sustained and extended its positive and welcoming campus climate.

## **Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2012 Team**

The visiting team found that LAHC has made significant progress since the previous Comprehensive Evaluation visit. Notably, the college has substantively addressed the seven recommendations made by the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation Team and the Commission. Nevertheless, the current visiting team concluded that focused attention to the following areas will strengthen the institution as it continues to grow and develop over the next several years. The following 8 recommendations are made as a result of the March 12-15, 2012 team visit:

### **College Recommendations**

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 need to be included. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.6)
2. As previously stated in Recommendation 1 by the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation Team and in order to meet the Standards, the college needs to demonstrate an operational and sustainable instructional program review process as evidenced by completed program review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.2.e)
3. 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. (III.D.2.d)

## **District Recommendations**

1. 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. (III.B.1.a, III.C, III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
2. In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, and to ensure the financial integrity of the district and the colleges, 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. (III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
3. In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend the district adhere to the annual required contribution (ARC) guidelines and closely monitor the planned process. (III.D.1.c, IV.B.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
4. In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, 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, 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. (III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c, IV.B.3.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)

5. In order 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 full understanding of its role in policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the chancellor or his designee. (IV.B.1.a)

## **Commendations**

The team found that LAHC generally demonstrates a high level of quality in its educational programs, student services, and administrative services. Specifically, the team found notable strength in the following areas:

### **College Commendations**

1. The college is commended for the increased availability of research and data, particularly with regards to the Fact Book on the college website.
2. The college is commended for its work on student learning outcomes, in particular its use of broad institutional-level student learning outcomes and their alignment with what employers' desire of graduates.
3. The college is commended for using its mission statement to guide planning and operation.
4. The college is commended for maintaining a diverse class schedule inclusive of online, face-to-face, weekend, evening, self-paced, and late-start offerings, despite fiscal reductions.
5. The college is commended for the rigor of the curriculum approval process that ensures high quality and integrity.
6. The college is to be commended for developing innovative student support services such as Fast Track, online Frequently Asked Questions, the Veterans Center, and technical support for former and current foster youth, to address emerging student needs in a time of declining resources.
7. The college is to be commended for its Life Skills Center, which provides mental health counseling and related services enabling students to meet the increasing personal, emotional, and environmental challenges that can interfere with their academic success.
8. The college is to be commended for its Library and Learning Assistance Center's ability to maintain an exceptional level of services and academic support to students and faculty despite constraints and limited resources.

9. The Faculty Hiring Priority Committee's Faculty Hiring Manual is an exemplary document. The college is commended for the collegial process and the evidence-based rubric used by the committee. The yearly committee review and revisions each spring keep the process dynamic and responsive to developments in the college.
10. The college is commended for providing multiple venues for professional development through the Professional Development Committee, Staff Development Committee, and Teaching and Learning Center.
11. The team is impressed with the inclusiveness and collegiality of the campus community. The college is commended for making strides in developing a culture of collegiality.
12. The team commends LAHC for the excellent appearance of the campus. It is evident that the college community really cares about the condition of the campus and it shows. With all of the current construction, the campus still maintains a high level of safety and cleanliness.
13. The LAHC IT team is commended for its innovative efforts to develop and support a system of centrally managed virtual PC's. It has taken an important step to realize a long-standing campus-wide commitment to achieve a "Virtual Harbor".
14. All constituency groups of the college – administration, faculty, students, and staff – are commended for their commitment to participatory governance and to fulfilling their responsibilities in the participatory governance process.
15. The president is commended for his leadership in efforts to increase communication amongst the constituency groups at the college. His participation in college committees, establishment of two summit meetings, and willingness to listen and to respect opinions of all have led to a climate of increased cooperation and trust at LAHC.

## **District Commendations**

1. The district office is commended for revising district service outcomes, district wide committee descriptions, and the district wide functional map to create a user-friendly and clear delineation of college and district functions. The process of survey, dialogue, and district wide review demonstrates a commitment to providing an informed understanding of the district's role in governance and service.
2. The district is commended for its commitment to planning driven by data and service to the colleges.

## **Response to Recommendations from the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation**

The college Self-Evaluation Report and the Comprehensive Evaluation Team Report were accepted by the Accrediting Commission in 2006 and included six recommendations:

**Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the college review and revise as necessary the current instructional program review process for effectiveness in improving**

**instructional programs based on District/College institutional research data (no program self-developed data) and that a key measure of program success be its response to discipline, cluster, and college developed SLOs. The team recommends that the review process should be completed with sufficient time to allow confirmation that the college has an operational and sustainable instructional review process as evidenced by completed program review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. Further, the college program review policy and procedures should reflect the key and decisive role of the administration of the college in decisions effecting scheduling of courses and the continuance/discontinuance of programs.**

**Recommendation 2: The college needs to develop an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. This should be based in deep analysis of District and institutional research-provided data and assure a broad involvement and participation in the institutional planning cycle.**

**Recommendation 3: Using the planning process and the governance process, the college should construct a meaningful dialogue about student learning which assures understanding and infusion of Student Learning Outcomes. This dialogue should rely on robust information focused on the accomplishment of students as defined in program, inter-departmental, and institutional student learning outcomes.**

**Recommendation 4: In making public the process of program review as well as the results, the college will regularly and in a timely manner review and update policy, planning, and procedure manuals.**

**Recommendation 5: The District should evaluate the impact of the revenue allocation model and consider the special conditions on individual colleges.**

**Recommendation 6: The functional relationship between the college and the District needs to be fully defined through a dialogue focused on efficient use of resources and service to students. The implementation of a decentralized relationship needs mutual definition.**

The college was directed to submit a Progress Report in 2008 on all six recommendations. The college complied with this directive. The Accrediting Commission accepted this Progress Report, with the provision that the college submit a Follow-up Report in 2008 followed by a Limited Visit by Commission representatives on four of the original recommendations (#2, #3, #4, #6).

In addition, the Commission tendered its own recommendation (**Commission Recommendation 1**) and directed the college to submit in 2009, along with its Midterm Report, a Follow-up Report demonstrating resolution of Commission Recommendation 1.

**Commission Recommendation 1: District Plan for Retiree Health Benefit Liability. The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year**

**obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution.**

The college complied with these directives. The Follow-up Report and Limited Visit Report were accepted by the Commission in early 2009 with the requirement that the college submit a second Follow-up Report along with its Midterm Report in mid-2009.

In mid-2009, the Commission subsequently accepted both the Midterm Report and Follow-up Report. However, the college was directed by the Commission to submit yet another Follow-up Report in 2010 addressing Commission Recommendation 1 once again.

This report was accepted by the Commission in 2010. In its Action Letter, in addition to reminding the college that all accredited institutions are expected to meet the standards that require the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes and the use of assessment data to plan and implement improvements to educational quality by fall 2012, the Commission re-expressed its concern “about whether the Los Angeles Community College District’s financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness”, particularly the provisions of Standard III.D “requiring a level of financial resources that provide a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency [necessitating] that the District and the college begin to act in a way that will create and implement funding plans to ensure that adequate cash or liquid resources be able to pay for OPEB liabilities at the time those costs become due.” Further, the Commission requested that the college and the LACCD provide in the college’s 2012 Self-Evaluation Report “information about how the ARC (minimum payment or Annual Required Contribution) is being handled and how funds in an amount at least equal to the ARC are being paid into an irrevocable trust in order to pay for liabilities as they become due.”

Our team evaluated the extent to which the college has met the six recommendations tendered by the Comprehensive Evaluation Team in 2006. We conclude that the college has substantially met, or is in process to meet, four of these six recommendations. The recommendations regarding planning and program review that were made in 2006 are only partially met, as the college has not yet achieved the sustainable levels of planning and program review for all programs and services of the college.

Regarding Commission Recommendation 1, our team has concluded that while the college and LACCD have made significant progress on the recommendation, it is not fully resolved. In particular, evidence reveals that while an actuarial study has been conducted recently and a funding plan developed, the college and the LACCD have been inconsistent in meeting the funding obligation for the ARC. As a consequence, the Commission’s concern for long-term financial solvency and the potential for significant impact on the general operating funds of the college and district persist.

## **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

### **1. AUTHORITY**

LAHC is authorized by the State of California to operate an educational institution and to award degrees.

## **2. MISSION**

LAHC has a clearly defined educational mission which has been adopted and published by its governing board consistent with its legal authorization. The mission is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and to the constituency the college seeks to serve. The mission statement defines the college's dedication to a diverse learning community and to the intellectual and personal growth of its constituents.

## **3. GOVERNING BOARD**

The governing board for LAHC is the Board of Trustees for the LACCD. It is responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of LAHC and for ensuring that the financial resources of the college are used to provide a sound educational program. Its eight-person membership (seven voting members) is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities. The governing board is an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions. None of the board members have employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The board adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that relevant interests are disclosed and that it does not interfere with the impartiality of governing board members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the college.

## **4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

LAHC has a chief executive officer appointed by the governing board who serves full-time in this capacity. The chief executive officer, in combination with the district chancellor, possesses the requisite authority to effectively administer board policies. Neither the chief executive officer nor the district chancellor serves as a member of the governing board.

## **5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY**

LAHC generally has sufficient staff, with appropriate preparation and experience, to provide the administrative services necessary to support its mission and purpose.

## **6. OPERATIONAL STATUS**

LAHC is fully operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

## **7. DEGREES**

A substantial portion of LAHC's credit educational offerings is programs that lead to associate degrees or occupational certificates, and a significant proportion of its students

are enrolled in them. LAHC's non-credit offerings consist of courses and programs to meet basic educational goals of adult learners, improving English skills, preparing for citizenship, learning new job skills, preparing for higher education, and becoming a productive, active participant in American society.

## **8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

LAHC's principal degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered, and culminate in identified student outcomes. The college's degree programs are of two academic years in length.

## **9. ACADEMIC CREDIT**

LAHC awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education.

## **10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT**

LAHC defines and publishes for the associate degree the expected student learning and achievement outcomes and it defines and publishes student learning outcomes for its student services. The college is engaged in the process of establishing student learning outcomes at the program and course level. It is also developing its program of regular and systematic assessment designed to demonstrate that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve these outcomes.

## **11. GENERAL EDUCATION**

LAHC defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills and an introduction to the recognized major areas of knowledge. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it. Degree credit for general education programs is consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education.

## **12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

LAHC faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general. LAPC maintains an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom and independence exist.

## **13. FACULTY**

LAHC has a substantial core of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The core is sufficient in size and experience to support all of the institution's educational programs. A clear statement of faculty responsibilities exists which includes development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning.

#### **14. STUDENT SERVICES**

LAHC provides for all of its students appropriate student services that support student learning and development within the context of its institutional mission.

#### **15. ADMISSIONS**

LAHC has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs.

#### **16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES**

LAHC provides, through ownership or contractual agreement, specific long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and instructional programs in whatever format and wherever they are offered.

#### **17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

LAHC documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability. However, as cited in District Recommendations 1-4, the college and district have not fully met this Eligibility Requirement.

#### **18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

LAHC annually undergoes and makes available to the public an external financial audit by a certified public accountant or an audit by an appropriate public agency. However, as cited in District Recommendations 1-4, the college and district have not fully met this Eligibility Requirement.

#### **19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION**

LAHC conducts on-going institutional planning and evaluation to ascertain how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. It is encouraged to further develop those structures and processes and to document them. LAHC provides some evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution does some assessment of progress toward achieving its stated goals. It should increase the degree to which it makes decisions regarding

improvement through an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation with appropriate resource allocation, and subsequent re-evaluation.

## **20. PUBLIC INFORMATION**

LAHC publishes a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, complete, and current information that includes all of the requisite elements.

## **21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION**

LAHC provides assurance that it adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the Commission, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.

### **I. Responses to the Previous Team's Recommendations.**

***Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the College review and revise as necessary the current instructional program review process for effectiveness in improving instructional programs based on District/College institutional research data (no program self-developed data) and that a key measure of program success be its response to discipline, cluster, and College developed SLOs. The team recommends that the review process should be completed with sufficient time to allow confirmation that the College has an operational and sustainable instructional review process as evidenced by completed program review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. Further, the College program review policy and procedures should reflect the key and decisive role of the administration of the College in decisions effecting scheduling of courses and the continuance/discontinuance of programs. (IB, IB1, IB3, IB4, IB5, IB6, IB7, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2f, IIA6b, IVB2)***

The Comprehensive Evaluation Team of 2006 expressed concerns about the college's planning process, and questioned the president's ability to have a meaningful role in the improvement of the teaching and learning environment. Further, that team noted the need for an evaluation process that looks at the overall planning and implementation efforts within the college, and concluded that the college's planning process did not appear to provide an assessment and data analysis that leads to increased institutional effectiveness.

The college has updated the Program Review Policy and Procedure Manual and included all departments as part of the process, although not all programs have completed a program review cycle. The college's mission statement guides its program review. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) are part of the process. While members of the college say resource priorities are linked to resource allocation, evidence of this is uncommon and not widespread. The college has not fully met the recommendation, as it is not at the sustainable level of program review for all college programs.

***Recommendation 2: The College needs to develop an on-going, systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. This should be based in deep analysis of District and institutional research provided data and assured a broad involvement and participation in the institutional planning cycle. (IB1)***

While the college has many plans, they are not integrated (e.g., the Educational Master Plan does not inform the other plans). In addition, there is not an on-going, systematic cycle of evaluation which includes integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. The college has access to data from institutional research, although it is not evident that decision making is based in deep analysis of the data.

The college has not fully met the recommendation.

***Recommendation 3: Using the planning process and the governance process the College should construct a meaningful dialogue about student learning which assures understanding and infusion of Student Learning Outcomes. This dialogue should rely on robust information focused on the accomplishment of students as defined in program, inter-departmental, and institutional student learning outcomes. (IB1, IB2, IB4, IIA1c)***

The college is using many means for employees to dialogue about the issues, including staff development, district wide workshops and activities, committees such as the College Planning Council and Academic Senate, as well as the Academic and Associated Students Organization Senates, and during period retreats. Other areas for dialogue include formal and informal department and faculty meetings.

The college has met the recommendation.

***Recommendation 4: In making public the process of program review as well as the results, the College will regularly and in a timely manner review and update policy, planning and procedure manuals. (IB3, IB5, IB6, IB7)***

The process for program review is public and is part of the college's annual planning cycle. Not all programs consistently are conducting program review.

The college has partially met the recommendation.

***Recommendation 5. The District should evaluate the impact of the revenue allocation model and consider the special conditions of individual colleges. (IIID, IVB)***

The district evaluated the impact of the revenue allocation model and considered the special conditions of its smaller colleges. A new allocation model was implemented in January 2007, and the process for budget shortfalls was again revisited in spring 2011. The District Budget Committee now issues recommendations to the colleges to assist in establishing balanced budgets. The recommendation was met; however, LAHC has only balanced its budget once under the new allocation model, and the fiscal year which is supposedly balanced has not ended as yet. Although the new model appears to be fairer to the colleges and takes into account costs

associated with smaller colleges, it does not appear to have resolved the fiscal problems. This prior recommendation has not been fully met.

***Recommendation 6: The functional relationship between the College and District needs to be fully defined through a dialog focused on efficient use of resources and service to students. The implementation of a decentralized relationship needs mutual definition. (IVB3a, c)***

The district addressed this 2006 recommendation by replacing its functional map with a revised 130-page version in 2008. This version contained descriptions roles of the district Board of Trustees and its committees; a definition of the functional relationship between the district and the nine colleges; a grid of District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs); and flow charts showing participation in administrative processes.

However, in 2009 ACCJC Comprehensive Evaluation Teams for three of the LACCD colleges again recommended that the district evaluate the accuracy of the delineation of district/college roles and responsibilities, and that it use the information to improve effectiveness of the district. A project that engaged faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in a dialogue on the mutual roles and responsibilities of the colleges and the district system was implemented. This project included 1) a review and revision of district office service outcomes; 2) and update of district wide committee descriptions; 3) Expansion of the functional map; and 4) implementation of a survey to assess the accuracy of the current definitions of the district/college relationship. The results of the surveys were used to create an assessment report with action items to improve unit performance and further refine district office operations.

These efforts resulted in replacing the 2008 Function Map with the 2010 LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook. It provides employees with a more accurate and informed understanding of the district's role in relation to the colleges. This handbook is reviewed and revised on a two-year cycle and the first revision was completed in spring 2012.

The college has addressed this prior recommendation.

***Commission Concern: The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution.***

In response to a Commission concern first communicated in 2008 and reiterated in 2009 and 2010, the LACCD established a plan to: 1) fund the medical retiree benefits on the pay-as-you-go basis, and 2) fund the ARC (annual required contribution) partially at 82%. To date, the district has not fully funded the ARC as planned. As a consequence, the concern for long-term financial solvency and the potential for significant out-year impact on the general operating funds of the District and its colleges persist. To continuous improve on the Standard, the present team recommends the district adhere to the annual required contribution guidelines and closely monitor the planned process. (IIIB1c, IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)

The Commission concern has not been fully addressed.

## **Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

### **General Observations**

The college's response to the Standard was not always clear or complete. During some narrative pieces, evidence was not available and many of the Actionable Improvement Plans were unclear. The college's mission statement, while reflective of the college's students, is succinct and used in many documents to guide the focus of the college. The college has many planning processes and has a timeline of planning events. The college has done a lot of work on the program review process and, to some degree, it uses data to make informed decisions about planning and resource allocation, but the evidence is hard to find online or not listed in the Self-Evaluation Report. The college uses data for decision-making and uses many venues to encourage dialogue about and evaluation of institutional effectiveness. The mission statement is included in key college documents and the college website, and is available to all employees, students, and the community.

### **Findings and Evidence**

#### **A. Mission**

The mission statement is succinct, clearly stated and aligned with the programs and services offered by the college. The current mission statement, as per the college's website is, "Our Mission: Los Angeles Harbor College fosters learning through comprehensive programs that meet the educational needs of the community as measured by student success, personal and institutional accountability, and integrity. An essential aspect of the mission for the community we serve is to advance economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous workforce improvement and civic responsibility. We are committed to student learning in a supportive educational environment that recognizes the uniqueness of individuals, provides a center for the cultural enrichment of the community and seeks dynamic dialog and reflective evaluation and improvement of the institution." (I.A)

The development of programs and services is done not only with the college's mission statement at the forefront, but also with the needs of the students and the community. The college has created many partnerships to help with the establishment of programs and services that support the mission. The college uses an environmental scan to formally gather data/information to evaluate the needs of the community and the college also does information assessments such as enrollment pattern analyses and Harbor Teacher Preparation Academy review. (I.A.1)

In November 2010, the College Planning Council (CPC) proposed a revised college mission statement to be the aforementioned. The mission statement was last approved by the Board of Trustees in December 2011. As there are differences in the mission statement as printed in the catalog and on the web site, the college should consider adding the date that the Board approved it so that it is clearer. Many departments also have their own mission statements which align with the mission of the college (e.g., Financial Aid). (I.A.2)

The mission statement is the central focus of the college's program review and planning processes that drives resource allocation. The cycle for reviewing the mission statement is unclear. The latest recommendation was made by CPC in 2010. The college is encouraged to create and follow a cyclical review of the college mission. (I.A.3)

The college is commended for using its mission statement to guide its operation. The college's annual Fact Book is a good resource of information that is used to help determine the intended population served and to assess the needs of the surrounding community. The Achieving the Dream (AtD) initiative creates dialogue and engagement about the data. The Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) also provides cross-department dialogue and use of data for improvement. The college is encouraged to continue providing opportunities for high-level engagement that lead to improved student success. In addition, the college should consider keeping more records of conversations of major dialogue that occur and the changes that transpire from those interactions. (I.A.4)

## **B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and Service Area Outcomes (SAO) exist within all areas of the college (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services), and assessment of these outcomes is ongoing although not complete. In addition, the college is making progress towards assessing the program and institutional Student Learning Outcomes. The college needs to maintain its schedule for SLO and SAO assessment and use the assessment data and results for improvements at the course, program, and institutional level in order to be at the level of proficiency by the ACCJC deadline of fall 2012, and ultimately to reach continuous sustainable quality improvement. (I.B)

Overall, dialogue at the college regarding program review, planning and assessment exists in many areas; however it is not always evident. The college is using many means to ask employees to dialogue about the issues, including staff development, district-wide workshops and through committees such as the College Planning Council and Academic Senate, as well as the Associated Students Organization. Other areas for dialogue include formal and informal department and faculty meetings. Based on a college survey, there is not a lot of confidence that the input provided during this dialogue is used in the decision-making process. For Student Learning Outcomes and Services Area Outcomes, there are examples of departments/programs (Nursing; History; Special Programs and Services; Facilities, Maintenance and Operations) that extensively are using dialogue for continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Administrative Services has completed a full cycle of evaluation of its Service Area Outcomes. There is evidence of full cycles of assessment in some areas of Student Services and Academic Affairs, but not every department/program has completed assessment. There does not appear to be an ongoing and systemic evaluation and planning to refine its program review process. (I.B.1)

Over the years, the college has gone from using a Strategic Plan to using an Educational Master Plan (EMP) – both including goals and objectives; however, within the 2008-12 EMP, there is a

Strategic Plan. The college's 2008-2012 EMP is replicated, for the most part, in its 2011-2012 EMP. It is not clear how the college is using its EMP, as well as why there are two EMP documents. The college has a "College Annual Plan" as part of its Planning Process flowchart, yet one is not currently available. The college needs to determine how to create and use these two plans to further its integrated planning sequence to improve institutional effectiveness. The college's Student Learning Outcomes process includes measurable objectives and goals that require groups/employees to work together toward their achievements. (I.B.2)

The institution's planning process is broad-based with ample opportunity for input by all constituencies. A Planning Process Flowchart provides an overview of the processes at the college and appears to be cyclical, but there is no evidence of a College Annual Plan and how the priorities within that plan are used to allocate resources. There are many other plans at the college (e.g., Educational Master Plan, Technology Master Plan), but they do not appear to be cyclical and it does not appear that the unit plans inform the master plans. The college is moving towards embracing the idea of ongoing, integrated planning, but is still at the development stage of the ACCJC Rubric on planning. Data is widely available and there is some evidence of it being used in planning, but the college should strengthen its use of data for decision-making. The AtD program should provide an opportunity for the college to achieve this goal. (I.B.3)

The college has many documents – the College Participatory Governance Agreement, its Planning Policy and Procedures Manual, and its Program Review Policy and Procedures Manual - that are used to guide the planning process. Throughout the process, there are many opportunities for employee input to the process at the unit and cluster levels. The meeting schedules also allow for this dialogue.

The college should consider how to improve part-time faculty members' access to and involvement in learning outcomes assessment. While the college is making a good faith effort to include part-time employees in assessing learning outcomes, more could be done. When there is no full-time faculty in a department, there is a procedure in place for paying part-time employees to be part of the outcomes process. There still needs to be a plan/process in place to systematically include part-time employees in the outcomes process in an authentic manner throughout the cycle. A documentation of this work also should occur.

As with many colleges, employees do not always understand the intricacies of the planning and resource allocation process. While meeting minutes and related documents show a high level of employee participation among planning meetings, the employees of the college are not sure their input is used in the decision-making process. Exploring alternative means to secure funding is a good demonstration of how the college listens to input and acts upon it. (I.B.4)

The college has many data sources that are publically available in order for the community to evaluate the college's effectiveness. Examples include the website, college presentations, and a "World Café". The World Café was an opportunity for the college to share data about its programs and receive feedback from the community at-large.

The college, however, agrees that it needs to develop a way to evaluate how the college assesses whether it is effectively communicating information about institutional quality to the public.

There is a lot of quantitative data provided and much of it resides on the college website, however there is no evidence that qualitative data is used. In addition, it is not clear how much these data are used for planning purposes. (I.B.5)

There is no evidence that the college assesses the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying all parts of the cycle. For example, the unit plans that fold into the cluster plans do not include an evaluation component. A review of the cluster plans does not indicate an evaluative component. A Planning Process Flowchart provides an overview of the processes at the college, but no cyclical evaluation component is evident. (I.B.6)

There is some evidence regarding mechanisms the college uses to gather evidence and use the results to improve the effectiveness of programs and services. The assessment of Institutional Student Learning Outcome #1 was an excellent example of using the results to plan and implement institutional improvements and reassessing in an efficient manner. On the other hand, some of the course outcome assessments state that they will be reassessed, but do not have any plans for improvements to inform the results of the assessment. While it is important to evaluate programs and services based on metrics, it is the overall evaluation system that appears lacking. (I.B.7)

## **Conclusions**

Based on the self-evaluation report, resource documents, and interviews with LAHC faculty, staff, and administrators, the team concludes that the college is in compliance with Standard IA and parts of Standard IB.

The mission statement is central to institutional planning and defines the college's educational purpose, intended student population and commitment to student learning. Overall, the college has a mission statement that was approved in 2011 and reflects its constituents' needs. The mission statement is contained in many of the documents on campus and it is used to guide the college in its work.

While there are many planning and program review processes on campus, the full integration of them is not evident nor is the evaluation of both the processes and the impacts of the planning. The college is trying to create a culture of evidence and the use of data for discussion and decision making. The college has a fact book and is using its Student Learning Outcome data for decision making and improving, at times, curricular and pedagogical perspectives. But it is not always clear how that information is used for decision making. The college is encouraged to continue to use data to inform all decision making.

The college partially meets the Standard.

## **Recommendations**

### **College Recommendation:**

1. As previously stated in Recommendation 2 by the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation Team and in order to meet the Standard, the planning process needs to reflect an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation that uses 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 on the programs and services needs to be included. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.6)

## **Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services**

### **A. Instructional Programs**

#### **General Observations**

LAHC offers instructional programs in both traditional classroom and online settings. The college has a wide range of degree and certificate programs as well as “transfer pathways” for students who wish to transfer to a four-year university. The college catalog and schedule of classes list 32 associate degree programs (A.A. and A.S.), 60 transfer pathway programs, and 22 certificate programs. LAHC has a diverse curriculum and offers courses in numerous formats in order to meet the needs of students. The college has an active Curriculum Committee that is primarily composed of faculty members. The committee approves courses and programs recommended by faculty in specific disciplines and reviews student learning outcomes for inclusion in the course outlines of record. The college has committed itself to an expansion of its online program in recent years.

LAHC has revised its program review process and has developed a schedule to review all instructional programs on a six-year cycle. The college collects data on student performance and student needs in order to plan and respond to demographic changes. Information about courses, programs, transfer pathways, and other relevant information is available in numerous formats: the college catalog, class schedules, and the college website.

#### **Findings and Evidence**

The college demonstrates that all instructional programs and courses, regardless of location or delivery, align with the mission of the college and uphold its integrity through a series of college and district curriculum reviews, yearly unit plans, and the college program review process. The Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves individual courses and their place within academic programs. The quality of degree, certificate, and transfer programs is evaluated through program reviews conducted every six years, with Career Technical Education programs reviewed every two years; however, not all instructional programs have completed their program reviews within the six-year cycle. An examination of both online general education courses and major preparation courses revealed that the online versions are comparable to traditional classes in terms of content, scope, and rigor. (II.A.1)

The college uses environmental scans prepared by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, occupational outlook information, high-school-to-community-college pipeline reports, advisory councils, outside CTE accrediting bodies, student surveys, and program review documentation to identify students' needs. In addition, analyses of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level are used to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes. (II.A.1.a)

The Curriculum Committee reviews and approves the delivery systems and modes of instruction proposed for all curriculum. Criteria used in this review include representative instructors, acceptance of courses for credit at transfer institutions, and content integrity. The college offers traditional, hybrid, online, and self-paced courses. It also offers a Middle College high school program, Harbor Teacher Preparatory Academy, for more than 400 students on its campus; the college-level courses offered at the academy are evaluated using the same criteria and methods as comparable courses offered at the college. The college uses an external vendor, Etudes, as its course management system for distance education. The college has seen an increase in online course offerings, doubling the number of sections and more than doubling the number of students within a four-year period, and it has created three online degree programs in Administration of Justice, Fire Technology, and Business Administration, all of which have been submitted as substantive changes to ACCJC and approved. (II.A.1.b)

The college has identified student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. The college's Assessment Committee has established a timeline for the assessment of SLOs at the course, program, and institutional level. The committee has created an Assessment Report form for programs to use in identifying related institutional outcomes; identifying intended course or program outcomes; the means of assessment and the criteria for success; a summary of data collected; and how the results are used. The form also requires that courses and programs be linked directly to one or more of the five institutional SLOs. The Assessment Reports posted on the college website show that most course SLOs have already been assessed and some have led to recommendations for improvement. Curriculum maps show the links between SLOs at the course level and those at the program level. As the college continues the assessment of course level SLOs, it will need to complete its assessment reports for the program level as well. The college evaluated the first of its ISLOs in the spring semester of 2011 and the second in the fall of 2011, and the college has a timeline for assessing the remaining outcomes. In order to achieve the Proficiency Level on the ACCJC rubric for student learning outcomes, the college will need to complete a full cycle of SLO assessment at all levels and use the results to make improvements. (II.A.1.c)

The college assures the high quality of all its courses and programs through college and district curriculum review processes, a six-year program review cycle (two-year for CTE programs), annual unit plans, a six-year course outline review cycle, and the regular assessment of student learning outcomes. The curriculum process includes an examination of the type of credit awarded and the delivery method. The team found evidence that not all instructional programs have conducted a program review within the six-year instructional program review cycle. (II.A.2)

The Curriculum Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, is responsible for evaluating and reviewing new and revised courses and programs. Each program review and annual unit plan committee is composed primarily of faculty members from the individual program area. Faculty members have primary roles in strengthening and developing instructional programs and courses including the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. (II.A.2.a)

The college relies on faculty expertise and advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. The development of course and program SLOs and curriculum maps originates with the faculty in each area. The curriculum maps show the links between SLOs at the course and program levels and identify whether students will be introduced in a specific course to the program level SLOs at the introductory, intermediate, or mastery level. The institutional SLOs were created from the different content areas of general education. The SLO Assessment Reports require programs to show links between SLOs at the course and program levels and those at the institutional level. The college has assessed two of its institutional SLOs and has developed a schedule for the assessment of the remaining SLOs. The college posts completed SLO Assessment Reports for courses and programs on its website. The college has evidence of development and assessment related to course-level student learning outcomes and has mapped these assessments to program-level outcomes. The college has evidence of college-wide assessments and dialogue related to institutional level student learning outcomes. (II.A.2.b)

Through the curriculum and program review processes, faculty use completion rates, degrees and certificates earned, and student progression to develop the criteria for deciding the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning for their courses and programs. Each department at LAHC has developed a six-year plan of course offerings to ensure that students can complete their degree and transfer requirements in a timely manner. The stated goal is to offer each active course at least once every two years. As part of their unit plans, departments determine the course offerings. (II.A.2.c)

The college offers a variety of instructional delivery modes including lecture, online, labs, hybrid, web-enhanced, self-paced, and learning communities. Faculty members within a specific discipline determine the appropriateness of a delivery mode and make proposals to the Curriculum Committee for a course to be offered as an online or hybrid class. (II.A.2.d)

The Curriculum Committee reviews courses and programs through an established six-year cycle. The Assessment Committee has established a similar six-year cycle for evaluating student learning outcomes. All programs are scheduled to undergo evaluation through the six-year program review cycle and through the development of yearly unit plans. Vocational programs undergo an additional review every two years. The team found evidence that not all instructional programs have conducted a program review within the six-year instructional program review cycle. (II.A.2.e)

Faculty members within programs develop course-level student learning outcomes and the means of assessment. The current assessment cycle calls for at least one course SLO in each program to be assessed each semester, and assessment results from student learning outcomes are

integrated into yearly unit planning and program review processes. The institution has mapped all course-level student learning outcomes to program-level outcomes, and these curriculum maps show the relationships between completed course SLOs and those at the program level. The college has identified in its Self-Evaluation Report a need to strengthen the connections between SLO assessment and college planning. (II.A.2.f)

The only departmental exam the college currently uses is for English 28 (Intermediate Reading and Composition), a prerequisite for the transfer-level composition class, English 101. Faculty members administer the English 28 exam near the end of the semester, and they holistically score the exam. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness evaluates the results of the exam to determine its effectiveness. (II.A.2.g)

Course syllabi include the course-level student learning outcomes. The college evaluates these outcomes through its assessment process and uses the results to improve student learning. Through an examination of course outlines, syllabi, the class schedule, and interviews, the team found that the college aligns its practice of awarding credit with the Carnegie Unit and with those of other systems of public higher education in California. The college does not offer classes that convert clock hours to credit hours. (II.A.2.h)

The college has developed and published student learning outcomes for degrees and certificates on the college website; however, program-level student learning outcomes are not included in the college catalog. Specific program level SLOs are evaluated through embedded course-level SLOs. Evaluation of course-level SLOs determines student achievement through which the institution awards degrees and certificates. Degrees and certificates are awarded based upon successful completion of a series of courses within a specific area or major and courses from general education. (II.A.2.i)

The college catalog and the class schedules specify the general education requirements to obtain an associate's degree or to transfer to a California State University (CSU) or a University of California (UC) campus. The inclusion of a class on the list of general education courses is determined by the curriculum process, which is faculty driven. The college does not have a general education philosophy that is stated in the catalog. (II.A.3)

According to the college catalog and class schedule, all degree and transfer programs require students to take courses in the natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, language and rationality, and health and physical education. The college's institutional SLOs address the topics of communication; cognition (critical thinking); informational technology; the ability to demonstrate the ability to be an ethical human being and effective citizen; the ability to demonstrate sensitivity to and respect for others and participate actively in group decision-making; and the ability to demonstrate self-management, maturity, and growth through practices that promote physical, mental, and emotional well-being. (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

The curriculum committee review process ensures that all degree programs focus on an area of inquiry or have an interdisciplinary core. According to the catalog, degree programs at LAHC require at least 18 units of study within a specific major or, in the case of the liberal arts and sciences major, 18 units within the areas of specific interdisciplinary emphasis such as arts and humanities, health and fitness,

mathematics and natural sciences, and social and behavioral sciences. Many programs require more than 18 units within a particular major. (II.A.4)

Vocational degree and certificate programs are developed using standards that ensure the scope and content of courses will provide students with the framework and knowledge necessary to effectively prepare them for career placement, external licensure, and certification. Accrediting and certification agencies, advisory committees, discipline faculty members, and the curriculum committee provide oversight and guidance to ensure quality. (II.A.5)

The college assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information regarding its courses, programs, and transfer policies in the college catalog, class schedule, and website. The accuracy is insured through a process involving faculty, staff, and management. Student learning outcomes for the institution, the programs, and the courses are available on the website but are not listed in the catalog. Course-level student learning outcomes are listed in course syllabi. (II.A.6)

The college catalog and the class schedule list courses that are accepted for transfer to California State University and the University of California. In addition to the articulation agreements with CSU and UC, the college has articulation agreements with several private universities in the Southern California region. The college catalog describes the process by which credits from other colleges and universities are accepted at LAHC. (II.A.6.a)

LACCD Board Rule 6803 details the procedure for eliminating programs. The specific details of the process for program discontinuance are also described in the college's Program Review Policies and Procedures Manual. (II.A.6.b)

The college reviews and updates the college catalog every two years. Faculty, administrators, and staff check for accuracy and consistency. A printed schedule is created each semester with an online version that is revised for new information and class offerings. (II.A.6.c)

The LACCD/Faculty Guild Agreement includes the district's policy on academic freedom, and LACCD Board Rule 9803 specifies student conduct including academic honesty. These policies clearly define the institution's commitment to academic freedom. (II.A.7)

The Academic Senate has endorsed the American Association of University Professors statement on faculty conduct, which states the expectation that faculty members will distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. The evaluation of faculty involves peer review and student surveys, as well as administrative oversight, giving regular opportunities to examine how faculty members represent ideas in their classrooms. (II.A.7.a)

The college publishes Standards of Student Conduct specified by LACCD Board Rule 9803 and the plagiarism policy adopted by the Academic Senate in the catalog, in the class schedule, and on its website. However, the consequences for academic dishonesty are not stated in the catalog or class schedule. (II.A.7.b)

LAHC does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct, nor does it attempt to instill specific beliefs or worldviews. (II.A.7.c)

LAHC does not offer classes in foreign locations. (II.A.8)

## **Conclusions**

LAHC has been very student-focused in expanding access by offering courses in a variety of formats and options. In particular, the college has done a substantial amount of work in expanding its online course and program offerings. The increased student demand for these courses has justified the college's commitment.

The college has been very diligent in identifying student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level. Assessment procedures for SLOs are in place already, and the college has developed a timeline for completing a full cycle of assessment. The college needs to maintain its schedule for SLO assessment and use the assessment results for improvements at the course, program, and institutional level in order to be at the level of proficiency by the ACCJC deadline of Fall 2012 and to reach continuous sustainable quality improvement.

The team suggests that the college make the programmatic learning outcomes available to students in its catalog. The team further suggests that the college formulate and make public its philosophy of general education to guide it in determining which courses will be included in general education.

Although all programs are scheduled to undergo evaluation through the six-year program review cycle, the team found evidence that not all instructional programs have conducted a program review within the established cycle.

The college partially meets Standard II.A.

## **Recommendations**

### **College Recommendation:**

2. As previously stated in Recommendation 1 by the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation Team, the college needs to demonstrate an operational and sustainable instructional program review process as evidenced by completed program review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.2.e)

## **B. Student Support Services**

### **General Observations**

The college offers a full complement of student support services that deliver innovative, resourceful, and responsive programs and services to prospective new and continuing students. The college offers a Welcome Center to serve prospective and entering students. Matriculation

services include an orientation session in addition to assessment. The college has instituted an Early Alert system to enhance student retention and success. Special Programs and Services serves students with disabilities and has implemented a Academic Success Action Plan to further serve this population. The Financial Aid Office has created a Veterans Center and has assigned a technician to assist former foster youth. Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) and Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education Program (CARE) support student access and educational equity. The Career Center helps students with transfer and career services and has launched online tracking of student transfers.

Student Services evaluates the quality of its services through administrative oversight, internal program review processes, external review processes, point-of-service surveys, and district-conducted student satisfaction surveys. Student learning outcomes and assessment plans, unit plans, and program review are used to insure the quality of student support services for both online and onsite students.

Online students are provided with admission and records, counseling and other matriculation services, financial aid, EOPS and CalWORKs, SPS/DSPS, tutoring, and 24/7 helpline services.

## **Findings and Evidence**

The college offers a full complement of student services that are responsive to the needs of the student body and the community and that support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the college. Additionally, the college offers a Welcome Center that introduces current high school and new applicants to the college and its matriculation services, and a Life Skills Center that addresses student mental health and adjustment needs. The Student Services Cluster has seen substantial fiscal reductions due to recent state categorical funding reductions. (II.B)

The college provides a range of student support services covering essential functions to distance learning students through its admissions and records, counseling, financial aid, EOPS, CalWORKs, and Special Programs and Services departments. The district student survey process obtains qualitative data via focus groups with distance education students. These innovative functions have brought cost savings and service improvements. (II.B.1)

The Student Services Cluster sets annual goals as a part of its planning process. These goals address both on-campus and online student needs. The cluster conducts program reviews, inclusive of student learning outcomes and service area outcomes, following the college's six-year program review cycle. Student feedback on programs and services is garnered through district student satisfaction surveys every two years as well as by point-of-service and other surveys conducted by the units. (II.B.1)

The college publishes an updated catalog every two years according to the Catalog Production Timeline. The college faculty, staff, and administration review the catalogue for accuracy and currency. The catalog is posted on the college's website as well as being distributed in print form. The catalog provides general information, degree and certificate requirements, major

policies affecting students, and the locations of publications where other polices may be found. (II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d)

The Student Services cluster uses program review, point-of-service surveys, the district student satisfaction survey, and external scans such as the 2010-2020 Economic Trends prepared by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to identify the learning support needs of students. The college has a range of programs and services, including recruitment and outreach, matriculation, Special Programs and Services for student with disabilities, International Students, EOPS (Extended Opportunity Programs and Services), CARE (Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education), financial aid, the Child Development Center, CalWORKs/GAIN, and counseling. Student surveys indicate that students are satisfied with the services and that the services enhance student success. In addition, there is evidence of improvements made to student services programs in response to student needs. (II.B.3)

The college provides the same quality of student support to distance education students as is does to those on site. Student Services uses the CCCApply online application service and other online processes include ones for registration, orientation, financial aid, EOPS, SPS/DSPS, and online tutoring and counseling. Counselors also have developed an online FAQs functionality that is complimented by online chat and email functions for student follow-up. Prerequisite enforcement is done electronically across the curriculum and early alert functionalities are usable for students in distance classes. The college offers 24/7 help desk services for Etudes; E.O.P.S. provides workshops via CCC-Confer; when needed in the identity confirmation process of online students, financial aid uses Skype; and SPS/DSPS has an online disability accommodation request functionality. In addition, student services uses email blasts to groups of students via E-SARS. These services are also available to students enrolled in outreach classes held on high school campuses in its service area. Student surveys indicate satisfaction with the availability and quality of student services, and recent surveys indicate that 19 percent of financial aid students never needed to visit the office. (II.B.3.a)

The college provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. The counselors offer personal development classes, the political science program provides a student leadership learning laboratory class, and the campus provides opportunities for students to be involved in student life through the Associated Student Organization's student government and clubs. The Student Senate serves as the representative body for students on campus, and its members serve on campus and district committees. Students have participated in town halls and forums in the community, the March in March events in Sacramento, and a Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) annual policy and advocacy conference. The student leadership expressed appreciation for the accessibility of the college president and vice presidents; the accommodating nature of faculty, staff and administrators; and especially for faculty classroom methods that include evaluation of student understanding. The Life Skills Center produced a workshop to address topics around campus violence. The college's Fall 2009 Student Survey revealed that 78.9 percent of the student body had not recently participated in any club activities, student government, campus publications, or sports. The college has instituted a "college hour" to provide a regular time for campus events and to encourage greater participation by students.

The Student Senate has administered a survey to students gathering data on student satisfaction with the college environment and the faculty. (II.B.3.b)

The college has counselor positions funded by the general fund or categorical funds and grant-funded counselors. Faculty hired as counselors must meet minimum requirements set forth by California's Title 5 as adopted by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. The counseling department provides career and transfer counseling among its services. The articulation officer provides counselors with updates on changes in articulation requirements. The Fall 2009 Student Survey found a high degree of student satisfaction with counseling services; online students were included in the survey and, of those who had met with a counselor, they also reported a high degree of satisfaction with the services being provided. SARS is used to enable online appointment-making functions and e-SARS is used to communicate with both traditional and distance learning students. Counselors work with students to develop educational plans that lead to degrees, certificates, and/or transfer. The counseling division has identified as one of its goals increasing the percentage of students with formal student education plans. Counseling completes regularly-scheduled program reviews. Counseling has also developed and assessed student learning outcomes. (II.B.3.c)

The college designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The Puente Program was started recently. Work being done as part of the Achieving the Dream program includes data collection to inform a holistic set of services for student retention and success, particularly for those identified groups of students with lower retention and success rates. Online information in the international students unit is offered in 14 languages. The campus sponsors a variety of activities each semester to promote awareness of diversity. There are various student clubs and activities that represent diverse groups and interests, including the Latina Leadership Student Network, the AB540 club, and the Black Student Union. The student government sponsored an International Awareness Day in 2011 to highlight the cultural backgrounds of LAHC students. (II.B.3.d)

The college Office of Institutional Effectiveness evaluates assessment instruments in terms of fairness and validity, errors of measurement, and disproportionate impact. The Assessment Center, the Matriculation Committee, and the matriculation coordinator ensure that assessment tests for English, English as a Second Language, and mathematics follow the guidelines from the State Chancellor's Office. The Fall 2009 English Assessment Validation found evidence that the placement tests had a disproportionate impact on different ethnic groups and older students. Similarly, the Fall 2009 Math Assessment Validation revealed disparate impacts based on gender and ethnicity. In both reports, there are recommendations for actions that could reduce the disproportionate impact. Since the 2009 validation process, the college has created a Fast Track program to provide entering students an opportunity to review and improve math skills and to support improvement in performance on placement and competency tests. The college plans to conduct its next validation study for assessment tests in the 2013-2014 academic year. The Matriculation Committee includes representatives from English, ESL, math, counseling, admissions and records, and a learning disability specialist among its members, and it makes recommendations regarding assessment to the departments that are involved in the validation of assessment tests. (II.B.3.e)

District board policy governs the maintenance of student records, including the confidentiality of those records. Copies of student records are not released without permission from the student, and access to student records in the student information system is password protected. Some student records in admissions and records, financial aid, EOPS, and SPS have been scanned and are stored in a document imaging system. (II.B.3.f)

Program review and student learning outcomes assessment provide the most comprehensive evaluation of student support services. There are numerous examples of student services contributing to the achievement of departmental and institutional student learning outcomes and using results of evaluation as a basis for improvement. Student services units undergo program review in accord with the college's six-year program review cycle. The 2004-2006 and 2010-2016 program review documents, including each unit's SLOs and SAOs, are on the college website. The units also undergo evaluation during the annual development of unit plans and during annual assessment of SLOs and/or SAOs. Instruments and methods include the district student survey, departmental point-of-service surveys, and focus groups. Several programs such as EOPS, SPS, and matriculation have undergone evaluation by external agencies as well. The college's assessment process requires inclusion of institutional student learning outcomes, methods of assessment and the criteria for success, a summary of the data collected, and plans for improvement. The Student Services SLO/SAO Assessment Reports show that 13 units have completed a full cycle of assessment while two units have not provided evidence that they have completed their assessments and evaluated the results. The college needs to maintain its schedule for SLO assessment and use the assessment results for improvements in student services programs in order to be at the level of proficiency by the ACCJC deadline of Fall 2012 and to reach continuous sustainable quality improvement. (II.B.4)

## **Conclusions**

The college's student support services provide programs and services supportive of student achievement and responsive to the college mission. Special student success-related initiatives include the Life Skills Center, the Veterans Center, and the Welcome Center. The cluster has a quality program review process and should continue its assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes in order to be at the level of proficiency by the ACCJC deadline of Fall 2012 and to reach continuous sustainable quality improvement. Online and telephonic functionalities provide seamless access for traditional and distance education students and provide more universal accessibility for current and prospective students with disabilities. Despite reduced funding, the intercollegiate athletics program has a history of providing a significant link with the college's surrounding community and a pipeline for at-risk students to the college and higher retention and completion rates.

The college meets Standard II.B.

## **Recommendations**

None

## **C. Library and Learning Support Services**

## **General Observations**

The Library and the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) provide significant support for the instructional programs of the college and contribute to student learning and overall student success.

Three full-time librarians and four library technicians staff the library providing a wide variety of services to instructors and students. Many forms of library support, including reference desk help, library databases, and information competency training are available to both on-campus and online users. The on-campus library provides a significant collection of more than 100,000 print books, a course reserve area, and individual and group student study spaces.

The library makes a significant effort to ensure that both on-campus and online students are provided with excellent support regardless of modality. A series of training videos has been developed, a 24/7 online reference desk help service has been established, and many full-text journals are available online.

The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) is currently located adjacent to the library; it encompasses the Tutoring Center, an open access computer lab, the Math Lab, the Literacy Center, the Writing Center, and the High-Tech Center. Each of these services provides specialized student support.

In summer 2012, the Library and the Learning Assistance Center will combine to become the Library/Learning Resource Center (LLRC). All LLRC services will be relocated to a new state-of-the-art building, funded by the LACCD bond projects.

## **Findings and Evidence**

The Library and Learning Assistance Center (LAC) provide direct support to the instructional programs of the college and a wide range of services to faculty and students. LAHC ensured that the Library and LAC are supported adequately despite funding reductions by the state. This support was demonstrated in 2011 by a project (funded by grant monies and the general fund) to replace various outdated holdings in the library. Currently, the Learning Assistance Center does not have a dedicated budget for instructional materials or equipment. However, the LAC staff has developed a system to place learning materials provided by instructors on reserve for student use. Computer equipment is old, but still usable; new equipment will be available when the new LLRC opens in fall 2012. The library has taken special care to arrange its reference help, library databases, and information competency training efforts in a manner that fully supports both traditional on-campus classes and classes that are taught fully online. The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) provides a wide range of support services that meet the needs of a wide variety of students who require special assistance to achieve success. The Tutoring Center provides individual and small group tutoring to students who have been referred by counselors or instructors. An open access computer lab is available for students who need access to a computer to support work on projects in any discipline. The Math Lab provides both a weekly mathematics workshop for students to attend on a weekly basis, and drop-in tutoring for students. The Literacy Center supports students enrolled in Developmental Communications 037 classes. The Writing Center is

sponsored by the Communications Division and works to improve all aspects of the writing process in support of defined SLO's. The High Tech Center, a dedicated computer lab/classroom and staff, provides technical and instructional support for students with disabilities. (IIC.1)

The college, as a member of the LACCD, uses the SirsiDynix integrated library system for cataloging, circulation and OPAC. The library's collection of books and databases is adequate to support its mission. All library computer labs were updated in 2010 and will receive new computers when the new LLRC building opens in 2012. Three different departments administer the LAC's various computer labs, and each lab is outfitted with older computer equipment so it is often delinquent in meeting student needs. This deficiency will be corrected when the new LLRC opens in fall 2012. The library and the LAC coordinate with academic departments to ensure that appropriate books and databases are available in the Library and that required learning materials are available in the LAC to support services to students. The library and LAC are represented on the College Planning Council, the Curriculum Committee, the Division Council, the Academic Affairs Cluster, and the Distance Learning Committee. This significant level of committee participation ensures that the library and LAC staffs are aware of the support services and materials required to fulfill the mission of the college and to enhance Institutional and Student Learning Outcomes. (II.C.1.a)

The library provides a program of ongoing instruction to enable students to use the library effectively and to support the information literacy standards approved by ACRL. This instruction is available in three formats: walk-in workshops, tailored instruction arranged by an instructor for a particular class, and online instruction provided by using on-demand videos. In addition to the general library instruction, which is available to all students, the library also offers two instructional courses for credit, Library Science 101 and 102. These courses teach information competency in an eight-week, one-unit, fully on-line format. At least two sections of these classes are taught every semester, and each section enrolls fifty students. (II.C.1.b)

The library is open on campus for sixty hours each week and provides an online interface that allows off-campus users with access to OPAC, databases, e-books, and online references. The library's website is well-done and provides a significant amount of information about the services that are available on-campus and online. The website also provides access to a series of tutorials that explain the Baxter Library's services in detail. In addition, the college has contracted for access to an online service called "Ask Us Now" that provides 24/7 reference services by professional academic reference librarians. The Learning Assistance Center is open for sixty hours each week and provides a wide variety of student support services. Although these services are primarily available to on-campus students, the LAC also provides limited services to online students. (II.C.1.c)

Security and maintenance have been adequate in the library. The lack of alarmed entrances and exits in the LAC has led to some ongoing security issues. Due to recent staff vacancies, there has been a limited ability to prevent or address disruptive behavior and inappropriate use of computers in the LAC open access computer lab. These issues should be resolved in the new LLRC building. (II.C.1.d)

The library and LAC contract with a vendor to provide printing and copying services. The library and staff monitor this vendor's performance to ensure quality service. Maintenance of the library catalog resides at the district level. The LAC contracts with NetTutor for online tutoring. (II.C.1.e)

The library and LAC use a number of assessment tools to evaluate their services, including program review, student surveys, course surveys, tutor surveys, and district student services Surveys. This data is carefully reviewed and fully discussed in annual unit plans. Both the library and the LAC have conducted recent program reviews and have produced multiple annual unit plans. They have used these excellent plans to justify future improvements and requirements. Library Science 101 and 102 each have eight student learning outcomes. All SLOs are assessed every time the courses are taught. Assessment data is used as the basis for revisions and improvements to the courses. (II.C.2)

## **Conclusions**

The library and Learning Assistance Center (LAC) provide direct support to both faculty members and students. Despite reduced funding, ongoing staff shortages, and preparations for moving into a new facility, the library and LAC staff members have continued to provide very effective services. The new LLRC building will resolve several long-standing equipment issues, improve security for all the services and activities, and provide a more integrated environment for all LLRC functions. These facility improvements will help to increase organizational efficiency and better utilization of staff.

LAHC's three full-time librarians and four library technicians have made a sincere commitment to organizing all library services, including reference help, library databases, and information competency training and providing access to both on-campus and online students. The LAC has added online tutoring to complement its face-to-face tutoring services.

The library and Learning Assistance Center conducted comprehensive program review and draft annual unit plans. Both units make effective use of data to form practical plans for future operations. Both the Library and LAC have maintained key services and academic support despite ongoing reductions in funding.

The college meets Standard II.C.

## **Recommendations**

None

## **Standard III -- Resources**

### **A. Human Resources**

#### **General Observations**

The quality of the Self-Evaluation Report is marked by differences in voice and areas where appropriate evidence was not accessible through document links. Evidence had to be collected on site. There is some disagreement between sections of the standard. For example, Standard III A, Human Resources highlights the issues with lack of staffing for facilities maintenance; however, Standard III B, Physical Resources, down-plays the difficulties due to reductions in

facilities and maintenance operations (FMO) staff. Standard III has the largest number of Actionable Improvement Plans proposed by the college, a total of 15 for the standard. There are a number of new buildings that have been brought on line over the past couple of years, and ongoing construction will result in more new buildings. The new buildings have been designed with significant increases in technology use. This sets the stage for changes in work load and support needs for facilities and IT personnel. It also may require the institution to think differently about how technology is replaced/replenished over time.

## **Findings and Evidence**

The college follows the district guidelines for recruitment and hiring. The criteria, qualifications and procedures for selection of faculty, staff and administrators are clearly stated and publicly available. Criteria for selecting faculty include knowledge of the subject matter, effective teaching as demonstrated in an extensive teaching demonstration, and familiarity with Student Learning Outcomes and assessment methods. Hiring committees are composed of a majority of the type of employee being hired. For example, faculty hiring committees include a majority of faculty on the committee. Degrees are verified during the screening process and again by Human Resources prior to the actual employment. Equivalency documentation for non-US degrees is required. (III.A.1.a)

The college systematically evaluates all personnel, faculty, classified and administrators. The college follows the collective bargaining unit agreements' specified processes and documents evaluations using the forms in each agreement for evaluations. The evaluation processes assess the effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are clearly documented with records kept at the district office and a copy maintained by the HR staff person on campus. (III.A.1.b)

The evaluation section of the Self-Evaluation Report focuses on faculty, not staff nor administration, and is unclear about how the evaluation holds faculty accountable for SLOs. However, faculty and instructional staff and administrators have, as part of their evaluation, participation in SLO development and assessment. A new faculty collective bargaining agreement has been recently approved. There is now a consequence for not participating in outcomes development and implementation. Specifically, hourly assignments can be limited until appropriate SLO participation is documented. This is true for both full-time and part-time faculty. Classified staff and administrators are evaluated on SLO participation in the narrative of their evaluations as appropriate. (III.A.1.c) The college upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel. (III.A.1.d)

The college maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The college has not met the state's Faculty Obligation Number which may result in fines. Similarly, not having full-time faculty in particular disciplines means that the college is paying stipends to part-time faculty to create SLOs and complete program review. However, the number of full-time faculty is currently sufficient to achieve instruction, committee work, and program planning. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purpose. Budgetary constraints have reduced staffing. New

buildings have increased demands for staff trained in the maintenance of new systems and technology. For maintenance emergencies, there is an outsourcing process in place where staff specific to those duties are no longer employed. (III.A.2.)

LAHC systematically follows the district personnel policies and procedures that are available to all. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered. (III.A.3.) The college and district human resources responsibilities are clearly explicated and appear to be well-understood by hiring supervisors and managers. The labor units and Personnel Commission have published agreements and guidelines. The district website includes all six union agreements. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures. (III.A.3.a)

Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law following the established district procedure. Records are secure and confidential. The Personnel Commission guidelines are online. (III.A.3.b)

The diversity section of the Self-Evaluation Report focuses on the handling of discrimination complaints. The complaints are handled through an appropriate district process publicized online and in orientation materials. Evidence for support of diversity was also found in professional development offerings provided by the Professional Development Committee, including cultural awareness training, and organization of activities by the Staff Development Committee, including Day of the Dead and Black History Month. (III.A.4.a)

The LACCD Human Resources Department collects and maintains records of its employment actions in order to assess its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with the mission of LAHC and the students it serves. The district has produced, and regularly updates, a long-term diversity plan consistent with its goal to achieve equity in the composition of its employees and the students the college serves. (III.A.4.b)

The college advocates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students. There has been improvement since the new president started in the perception that faculty, staff and administrators are treated with integrity. The college demonstrates a commitment to continue on this path. (III.A.4.c)

The college provides multiple venues for continued professional development consistent with the institutional mission based on identified teaching and learning needs. The college uses surveys sent out by the Professional Development Committee and by the Teaching and Learning Center to identify the training needs of faculty and staff. The district provides open training to classified staff related to systems and processes used district wide. The college sends staff to these training opportunities and uses a train-the-trainer methodology to spread the knowledge in service areas. (III.A.5.a)

The Professional Development Committee, Staff Development Committee, and the Teaching and Learning Center all systematically evaluate professional development activities at the end of each workshop or seminar through a participant questionnaire. The faculty bargaining unit also has professional growth funds which are distributed by the College Professional Growth

Committee. The process for receiving funds requires reporting out on the funded activity by the recipient to the college community. The Teaching and Learning Center also follows up with participants later through conversations with participants to find out how they are using the skills they acquired. A district wide committee developed outcomes for professional development, but there has been no follow-up to assess those outcomes. (III.A.5.b.) The Self-Evaluation Report mentions “a general confusion regarding the differing roles of the FLEX and Staff Development committees.” The Professional Development and Staff Development Committees themselves were clear on their roles as were other faculty and staff interviewed during the visit; however, the website does not clearly delineate the two.

The first planning agenda in Standard III relates to documenting hiring requests within the college plan. (III.A.1.a) The Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee’s manual and practices require programs which request faculty to demonstrate a completed program review and uses a rubric to compare program faculty requests based on data. The committee makes recommendations to the Academic Senate which recommends to the president. However classified and management staffing priorities do not follow a data-driven rubric and program outcomes in the same way. During the program planning process, programs identify classified staffing needs, which are prioritized by their respective clusters. The dialog within clusters is productive and evidence-based; however, the process at College Planning Council is voting based on presentations. The college presented a draft Human Resources Staffing Plan, 2010-2015 to the team. This draft has not been approved or acted upon yet. It is a preliminary collection of documents, mostly from district human resources, which tie staffing to the College Strategic Plan (Goal 7) and to revenue. The draft document does not clarify how staffing is based on evaluation and data-driven decision making.

## **Conclusions**

LAHC is substantially in compliance with Standard III.A. The Self-Evaluation Report provided scant evidence in a number of areas, which raised questions about how the college implements some of the parts of the Standard. Investigation on campus turned up many documents which would have been usefully linked to the Self-Evaluation Report statements.

The Faculty Hiring Priority Committee’s Faculty Hiring Manual is an exemplary document. The College is commended for the collegial process and the evidence-based rubric used by the committee. The yearly committee review and revisions each spring keep the process dynamic and responsive to developments in the College.

The team suggests the college adopt a cushion of full-time faculty beyond the Faculty Obligation Number provided by the state in order to avoid fines being imposed. (III.A.2)

The team suggests that the college and district Personnel Commission work together to provide more flexible categories of classified staffing for smaller colleges. Because classified staff at a small college must be able to work as generalists and cross-functionally, the specialist classifications imposed by the Personnel Commission limit the college’s ability to respond to employee absences, and insistence upon specialization by programs can also limit the services provided to the campus community. (III.A.2)

The team suggests the college more formally assess the learning outcomes, not just post-workshop satisfaction, of professional development efforts provided by the various committees and the Teaching and Learning Center.

While the college has begun to integrate human resource planning with institutional planning, it has not yet achieved the systematic assessment of human resources and used the results of assessment for the basis of improvement across all types of employees. (III.A.6.)

The college partially meets Standard III.A.

## **Recommendations**

See College Recommendation 1.

## **B. Physical Resources**

### **General Observations**

The institution plans its building program based on three key plans. Those plans, the Facility Master Plan, the Scheduled Maintenance Plan, and the State Space Inventory, are updated annually. The plans are submitted to the district office and are compiled with the other colleges and submitted to the State Chancellor's Office. All building plans are tied to state regulations that govern square footage of institutions and how that space is utilized. The plans are reviewed with the Education Master Plan in mind and have input from all constituencies of the college. However the team could not find direct evidence to show that physical resource planning is integrated with Educational Master Plan. All building is currently funded by bond monies from propositions A/AA/J. (III.B.1.a)

The college Facilities and Maintenance Operations (FMO) department is responsible for ongoing maintenance of college facilities. (III.B.1.) The work of the college Work Environment Committee (WEC) is very important to the college. This group is comprised of all constituencies of the college and is charged with disaster planning, signage, safety inspections as well as other issues relative to the well-being of the institution. It is apparent from the overall appearance of the campus that people really care about the campus.

The LACCD has implemented a moratorium until November 2012 on the initiation of any new capital construction projects district-wide. This action was undertaken in order for the district to conduct a thorough review of its capital construction program that had been cited for mismanagement, among other shortcomings, in the print and electronic media, and audits conducted by the district's independent auditor and the State Controller. While the effects of construction delay have been noted as a serious problem elsewhere in the district, LAHC reports that the moratorium has not produced similar negative consequences there.

## **Findings and Evidence**

LAHC provides for insuring the safety of its students, staff, faculty, and administrators. The FMO department regularly assesses the condition of the campus to insure that there are no safety hazards. Monthly, FMO staff checks the operation of all fire extinguishers insuring that they are in working order. There are evacuation chairs at the top of every stairwell on campus. The Work Environment Committee (WEC) meets regularly to review facilities effectiveness. A subset of this group does regularly scheduled walks around the campus to assess the existence of any safety hazards and compliance with ADA. There are also evaluations of facility effectiveness during division or unit meetings, unit planning, and at meetings of the academic or student services clusters. (III.B.1)

The passage of Bond Propositions A, AA, and J have infused the college and district with funds needed to transform the College to meet the current needs of our technology-driven environment. Several new buildings have come on line since 2007 including the Northeast Academic and Student Services and Administration buildings. A technology, central plant, and facilities maintenance buildings have further changed the look of the campus. Several other building projects' major upgrades have not only transformed the look of the campus but also their environmental designs have saved the campus dollars in utility bills. Campus planning and development is coordinated between the Educational Master Plan, the Five-Year Capital Construction Plan, the Space Inventory Plan, and the Five-Year Scheduled Maintenance plan. A combination of these plans developed through shared governance has provided a road map to assure effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support student learning and programs. (III.B.1.a.) The college is instituting a preventative and predictive maintenance program to prolong the life of building systems and to identify and assess current and future repair needs.

With the influx of new construction, inherent issues have arisen which relate to signage, ADA access, health and safety, and security. The college is addressing each of these issues. The college website provides an interactive campus map to highlight buildings, construction, and available parking during this time of college growth. There is signage on campus that helps people find their way around construction sites and to warn them of unsafe areas. Weekly meetings between the construction project management (CPM) firm and college staff, faculty and students are held to insure that construction does not interfere with instruction. The FMO manager has daily contact with the CPM firm to insure that the campus operations are coordinated with construction and to insure that interference with instruction is kept to a minimum. Dissemination of information regarding construction is disseminated through the website, notices from the president, announcements in committee meetings and through the student government. (III.B.1.b)

ADA compliance in new buildings and in capital maintenance projects are reviewed by the campus ADA subcommittee, chaired by the administrative vice president and an ADA specialist. There is an ongoing open dialogue that includes facility and construction managers, administrators and faculty to ensure accessibility issues are addressed. (III.B.1.b)

The college follows its mission and goals by ensuring that the new classroom and student services buildings were constructed first to meet student needs. All construction is being planned to maximize the learning areas of the campus. In doing so, the campus contracted with

an architectural firm to create the Facilities Master Plan, which included forecasting five, ten, and 30 years into the future. The LAHC Facilities Master Plan included input from a large group of constituents, comprised of homeowners, business and community leaders, students, and senior citizens. The plan was developed in relation to other planning documents such as the Educational Master Plan, Five-Year Capital Construction Plan, the Space Inventory, and the Five-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan. These plans are assessed and updated on a yearly basis for the future five years. (III.B.2)

Instructional classroom use is not always coordinated with the FMO group. This causes issues when facilities are being used and the FMO group does not know that the facilities are being used. The data should be available through the scheduling system, but is not shared with the FMO group. Better coordination between all areas of the college and the facilities group could insure that cleaning and scheduled maintenance can be scheduled when facilities are not in use. (III.B.2)

The college has been able to reduce cost of building utilities and maintenance by planning construction in a more environmentally-efficient way. The inclusion of solar energy in most construction plans has reduced the cost of utilities; however, the team did note that some dictates in “green” building from the district did not provide for additional upkeep costs that are hard to fund on an on-going basis. (III.B.2.a)

As noted in the observations section of this standard, all of the plans are assessed on an annual basis and are updated and modified in accordance with the changes in the Educational Master Plan. The updates of the annual facility plans are vetted through shared governance committees before being finalized and submitted to the district and sent to the State Chancellor’s Office. (III.B.2.b)

## **Conclusion**

The college has a Facilities Master Plan that was developed through participation of both internal and external constituencies. The college has a documented process for addressing facility needs and improvements. Decision making regarding facilities is shared among campus groups.

The college meets Standard III.B.

## **Recommendations**

None

## **C. Technology Resources**

### **General Observations**

There has been a noticeable improvement in the organization and effectiveness of the IT structure at LAHC since the last accreditation visit in 2006. The college clearly understands the

role of the district IT organization, and there is a fully integrated local IT structure at the LAHC campus.

In recent years, LACCD has significantly improved the IT organization at the district level. There is a Technology Planning and Policy Council (TPPC), which is an advisory body representing administrative, academic, and technology interests on a district-wide basis. There is also a District Technology Council (DTC) comprising the Chief Information Officer (CIO), the IT managers from every campus, all district technology managers, and some of the senior district computer network support specialists and data communications specialists. The DTC sets district-wide standards that apply to all campuses and makes policy recommendations to the TPPC.

The district also establishes master contracts to allow all campuses to purchase software and equipment services more easily, and less expensively, than would be possible if each campus acted independently.

Integrated technology planning and implementation is vital given the campus-wide building program enabled with Prop A/AA/J funds. This process was given new credibility because of the establishment of the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) in 2006. The same year a specific campus-wide commitment was made to work toward a “virtual” Harbor College.

The ATAC is a revision of the previous Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC), and it was specifically structured to provide academic input into the technology planning process. In 2011, the ATAC was renamed again as the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC). This was done to expand the scope of the committee’s considerations to all technology issues that relate to the campus—but with continued focus on academic input and Student Learning Outcomes.

Over the intervening years, the TAC has helped to set reasonable expectations on campus. TAC also acts as the liaison between the academic and technical communities on campus. Perhaps TAC’s most significant achievement is the Technology Master Plan, which articulates the College’s technology vision and further integrates technology into the planning process. The end result of this revised campus planning process has been to ensure that technology is implemented in direct support of instructional needs and not as an end in itself. (III.C.1)

## **Findings and Evidence**

The Technology Master Plan for LACCD was approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2011. It provides overarching policies for the entire district. LAHC has developed a Campus Technology Master Plan. The plan is well-written, but it is still in final draft form. It is scheduled for review by the Academic Senate and final campus approval before the end of spring semester 2012. (III.C.1.a)

All hardware, software, or services that are to be implemented campus-wide are approved through the college planning process and in conjunction with the Technology Master Plan. In addition to campus wide technology requirements, discipline specific technology needs are identified and developed in Division Unit plans and within Division Council meetings. (III.C.1.a)

It is intended by the college that the TAC serve as a “clearance” committee in the college planning process, thus ensuring that IT-related planning and budget decisions are properly coordinated and in conformance with the draft Campus Technology Master Plan. (III.C.1.a)

On-campus students receive appropriate training in information technology from their instructor in relation to coursework in all IT-specific disciplines; in the case of students participating in online instruction training is received by completing the Etudes online orientation. Training in information technology for LAHC employees is provided through the Human Resources Office. Interviews of faculty and staff revealed general satisfaction with the quality and comprehensiveness of the training. (III.C.1.b)

In spring 2010, the college opened The Teaching Learning Center on the second floor of the old library building. Two part-time faculty members staff the center and they provide a wide variety of technology workshops and one-on-one training for faculty. Although staff development funding is in short supply, technology training is available through @One. In addition to the on-campus training listed above, LACCD maintains the Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy, which provides a semester-length course in integrating technology and pedagogy. (III.C.1.b)

All district-wide IT administrative needs are planned, maintained and operated by LACCD personnel. In addition, LAHC maintains its own IT department, which is responsible for the planning, acquisition, management, maintenance, and operation of the all campus-specific IT infrastructure and equipment. The campus IT department comprises an IT Director and five full-time staff members. (III.C.1.c)

Most individual technology resources are purchased by departments with their own funds. Those purchases made with block grant and Title V funds are discussed and evaluated in the groups which oversee those funds. With the passage of Propositions A/AA/J, the college has been able to allocate sufficient bond funding to upgrade its IT infrastructure and ensure that it will be reliable in the future. (III.C.1.c)

There are computer labs and other technology resources at many locations across the campus, which provide support for college courses, programs, and services. There are computer labs in the Learning Assistance Center, the Library, the Northeast Academic Building, and the Technology Building. There are also computers available for student use in the Student Services and Administration Building, and in labs in the Transfer Center, the Welcome Center, and EOPS. (III.C.1.d)

Full-time and adjunct faculty members are provided with access to office computers and there is an online work-order request system in place to request technology support. All faculty members have an assigned email address and are encouraged to include email information in their syllabi. (III.C.1.d) Comprehensive Evaluation, technical support for the campus has improved significantly. This statement was frequently confirmed during the team’s visit to the campus. It is clear that the college actively encourages the use of technology all across the campus to promote student success. (III.C.1.d) The current college planning model requires technology planning to be directly linked to college wide planning. Independent requests for instructional technology equipment originate in instructional or classified units and are then merged into cluster plans and finally into the College operational plan in

accordance with the Planning Policy and Procedures Manual. Ongoing discussions with faculty and staff, both individually and through various campus groups, shape all IT recommendations. (III.C.2)

Methods for measuring the effectiveness of technology vary depending on the configuration of the technology asset. For student computer labs, students are sent surveys to get their feedback. The amount of time students spend online using campus computers is also tracked. Communication between faculty members and support staff is encouraged, since the information exchanged can resolve or avoid configuration problems in classrooms. TAC discussions focus on the effectiveness of current technology, and the instructional input in these discussions makes them very valuable in resolving planning and configuration issues. (III.C.2)

## **Conclusions**

The college has arrived at a point where technology planning is fully informed by instructional requirements. Both faculty members and technology support staff work diligently to ensure that the correct technologies are provided in the classroom and for administrative support services to ensure student success and administrative efficiency.

The new and expanded role of the Technology Advisory Committee, which highlights coordination between academics and technology, has been very successful and has brought about confidence in the overall planning process of the college.

The Self-Evaluation Report mentions that there is broad consensus that a systematic, campus wide technology refresh policy should be established at the college level and built into future campus budgets. Given that the level of funding made available by Propositions A/AA/J will not be available when the current equipment is no longer under warranty, this is clearly a sensible next-step in campus technology planning.

The Campus Technology Master Plan is well done and has been updated frequently over the last several years. However, the plan is still officially in draft as a result of all its frequent updates. The plan would gain both in credibility and effectiveness if it were fully and formally approved by the Academic Senate and the College Planning Council.

The college meets Standard III.C.

## **Recommendations**

None

## **D. Financial Resources**

### **General Observations**

The Self-Evaluation Report notes that the biggest improvement in the college's management of its financial resources since the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation is the projected balanced budget for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, after more than a decade of successive yearly deficits. Current

financial reports, however, estimate the general fund budget will be overspent by approximately \$1,272,077. This amount will be offset by funds earned by community service rentals including the golf range, the middle college contract, and the weekly swap meet. The college also requested an augmentation of its budget from the district in an amount of approximately \$900,000 due to instructional hiring to meet the Faculty Obligation Number. The college estimates that this augmentation will be received in June 2012. The college also leverages grant funding by integrating those funds with the overall college budget and planning process. (III.D)

## **Findings and Evidence**

The budgetary process of the college should link financial planning with the college mission and goals. The college is committed to linking budget allocation to institutional planning; however with the current state budget environment there is not much funding over and above the fixed costs of the college. With so little funding, the college cites that it is struggling to use institutional educational planning to allocate funds. The college first budgets all permanent filled positions, benefits and fixed costs which include expenses like utilities, dues and memberships, and catalog and schedule costs. Each College Cluster submits a priorities list and the College Planning Committee ranks requests based on available funding. The Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee is charged with ranking vacant faculty positions and based on funding recommend which faculty positions to hire. There is evidence that the faculty hiring process is tied to unit plans. (III.D.1.a)

The College Planning Policy and Procedure Manual defines the role of the College Budget Committee in relation to the College Planning Council. The Budget Committee provides CPC and the cluster planning committees with all relevant college and district fiscal data and projections along with analysis of apparent fiscal trends and alternate proposed scenarios for response to the fiscal data. The Budget Committee may provide clusters with projected allocation targets based on prior year percentages as a planning guide, but actual cluster funding results from CPC prioritization of proposed cluster activities as the college annual plan. The Budget Committee insures that the activities authorized in the college annual plan are funded in priority order by available funding from all applicable sources, and that no activity is by-passed for one having lower priority, except when the costs of the former exceed funding available from all applicable sources and the costs of the latter do not. Again, it is important to note that the CPC has wide representation from the campus community. (III.D.1.b)

The district has struggled to maintain a large enough fund to support long-term costs of employee benefits. LACCD is not making the minimum payment or Annual Required Contribution (ARC) to accumulate unfunded liabilities that will require cash to be paid out when benefits are paid to retired employees. The consequence of not funding an amount that is at least equal to the ARC is that an unfunded liability will be recorded on the financial statements of the district and the colleges and the ending fund balance or reserves will decline. Eventually, unless this liability is funded, the district and the colleges' financial condition will deteriorate to a level that will make it difficult for colleges to meet accreditation standards. (III.D.1.c)

The district annually directs 1.92 percent of the previous fiscal year's full time employee payroll into an irrevocable trust, managed through CalPERS. Also an amount equivalent to the district's annual Medicare D refund is diverted from its operating budget into the trust. As of June 2011,

the balance in the trust was \$30,311,536. Based on a document submitted to the district for the fiscal year 2011 audit, Aon Hewitt, the consulting firm that provides the district's actuarial study, estimates the required actuarial accrued liability at July 1, 2011 is \$588,168,000. The total unfunded accrued liability is \$553,983,000. The District is currently funding 82 percent of the annual required contribution. The district continues to monitor its liabilities and continues to assess the adequacy of its annual contribution. (III.D.1.c)

The district's role in the budget process is to provide information, establish district wide enrollment targets, provide a framework for fiscal accountability, and assure compliance with state and federal mandates. A budget calendar and a Budget Operational Plan are developed each year to provide colleges and the district office with guidelines and processes to develop their annual budgets. Each year the college responds to the Budget Operational Plan by developing their revenue projections and expenditure needs that are, in turn, submitted to the chancellor. The Budget Operational Plan is a detailed report that lists estimated revenues generated by departments and all expenses identified by each business area. The report lists all funded positions by FTE and salary. All funds are included in the report. The resource requests identify needs necessary to support planning for the upcoming year.

The district financial computing systems provide current budget, revenue, and expense information and can be accessed by campus staff. Each campus is given a base budget that includes salaries for the president, vice presidents of academic affairs, student services and administrative services, facilities manager, institutional research dean plus benefits. Campuses are also allocated funds for deans based on the size of the campus. Additional base funding is calculated on the square footage of each campus times \$8.36. Funding over the base is calculated on FTES. Small colleges are given an additional \$500,000 due to economies of scale. The district provides necessary assessment tools to inform the college governance bodies with financial information to make informed decisions. (III.D.1.d)

The district maintains the required reserve of 5 percent or \$25 million. The ending fund balance for LACCD for fiscal year 2010-2011 was approximately \$79 Million. LACCD maintains an appropriate reserve to support short term financial plans.

The LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook defines the district and college planning and budget allocation process. The District Strategic Plan (DSP) establishes a framework of goals that guides but does not constrain planning at the college level. The colleges align their strategic goals and annual planning priorities with those of the DSP and establish annual budget priorities in support of these goals. The college budget development process is inclusive of all campus constituencies. The district budget is developed each year with extensive consultation with the District Budget Committee. This body proposes fiscal policy through a Board-approved budget allocation mechanism that distributes funds to the college. A budget calendar and Budget Operational Plan format are developed each year to provide colleges with guidelines and processes to develop their annual budgets. The College Planning Policy and Procedure Manual defines the planning and budget process. The District Budget Committee provides the College Planning Committee and cluster planning committees with relevant college and district fiscal data and projections. The District Budget Committee distributes funds based on activities authorized in the College annual plan in priority order by available funding sources. (III.D.1.d)

The LACCD Business Division/Controller's Office is responsible for the maintenance of all financial systems and for providing financial and accounting services to the colleges and the district as a whole. This office has the following functions and service areas: Budget and Management Services, Accounting, Disbursement of Accounts Payable and Payroll, Central Financial Aid. District Finance is responsible for ensuring all strict adherence and compliance with the California Community College Budget and Accounting Manual and California Education Code. The campus can download reports from the financial accounting system maintained at the District level. (III.D.2)

The district has an annual external audit. The audit for fiscal year 2011 was due by December 31, 2011. In reviewing the last three audits of the LACCD (2008, 2009, and 2010), the team noted material weakness and significant deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting functions of the district. Further in the latest audit available (2010) there were significant deficiencies identified over internal control over major federal programs.

The material weakness noted in the 2010 audit related to the financial reporting and oversight of the district's General Obligation (G.O.) Bond Construction Projects (Proposition A, Proposition AA and Measure J). LACCD contracted with a program management firm to manage these bonds. LACCD also utilizes the County of Los Angeles to levy ad valorem property taxes to fund the debt service payments on the G.O. bonds.

There were three major issues noted by the audit team during their review: 1) The district does not currently have adequate policies and procedures in place that allow them to identify and record capital asset expenses in the proper period in accordance with GAAP. Exceptions were noted during the capital asset test work, which required additional analysis by management; 2) the district does not currently reconcile furniture and equipment purchased with bond proceeds to the actual equipment received and tagged into inventory; and 3) the district requires all employees of the LACCD Administrative Regulations as C-5 Categories and C-6 Designated Positions as having procurement oversight responsibility to annually submit a California Fair Political Practices Commission Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700) and the Board Rule XIV, Conflict of Interest Code for the LACCD. It was noted that there does not appear to be adequate controls in place to reconcile the information included in these forms with vendors or subcontractors utilized by the district. Due to the findings of these audits, the district imposed a temporary moratorium on construction projects as a means to evaluate construction plans going forward. Although this moratorium has created difficulties elsewhere in the district, it does not appear to have negatively impacted LAHC. (IIID2a, IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)

The audit recommended that the district work with the Program Manager to design and implement internal controls to ensure that capital assets are being tracked and recorded in a timely manner, reconciled to accounting records, and reported in accordance with US GAAP for governmental organizations. They also recommended that the district strengthen its controls related to the reporting and tracking of potential conflicts of interest. Those controls should expand the representations made by vendors and subcontractors to require self-reporting of potential conflicts of interest. Finally, the audit recommended that LACCD management

implement processes and controls to determine that expenses, revenues, and accruals are recorded and disclosed in accordance with GAAP. In the audit response by LACCD, it began to address these material weaknesses by implementing controls and processes to ensure capital assets are recorded and reconciled in a timely manner, improve the process of reconciling furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) purchased with bond proceeds to the actual equipment received and tagged, and strengthen its processes and controls in the review of the Form 700 for potential conflicts of interest related to the use of bond funds by the vendors and subcontractors employed as part of the district's bond program.

Significant deficiencies concerned employee benefit reporting and reconciliations, management workers' compensation, and security of the information technology system were noted. Security of information technology was also noted during the fiscal year 2007 audit.

In relation to the reporting of federal funds, there were several significant deficiencies identified in the audit. All of these significant deficiencies were related to financial aid reporting and many were repeat findings.

Further in an audit of the Bond Program (A/AA/J) by the State of California, major concerns regarding these bonds were raised. They included the following: 1) funding of unauthorized projects; 2) insufficient control over expenditures by the district; 3) improper hiring of the Inspector General; and 4) inadequate oversight by the Citizens Oversight Committee. (III.D.2.a) The college depends on the District Office Business Division for several services and financial direction. The district office includes district financial accountability; fiscal reporting to public and private entities; allocation of financial resources; and development, interpretation and implementation of the rules and policies of the Board of Trustees and the district administration including the chancellor. The Office of the Vice President for Administrative Services compiles reports monthly estimating expenditures for the fiscal year. These reports are disseminated throughout the college. Adjunct faculty expenses are harder to track. The team noted that personnel action forms are not routed through the Vice President of Administrative Services (VPAS) office to determine if there is sufficient budget to cover the salary expenditure. The VPAS office only approves personnel actions that affect that office. The team noted this as an area of concern, as without this check, it makes it very difficult to maintain position control and effectively monitor the extremely large salary budget. To make salary projections, the VPAS office has to use salaries posted in the middle of the following month to project yearly expenditures.

The college regularly meets with the district finance office to review expenditures. The district poses questions related to current spending and the VPAS responds to each of the questions to address issues related to possible areas of over expenditures. The VPAS office runs financial reports monthly to make financial projections. These reports are disseminated to all areas of the college. (III.D.2.b)

Although the college is forecasting a balanced budget for FY2012, it has run a deficit for the last several years. With careful planning and the allocation of funds based strictly on planning documents, the college professes to have sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability. With limited control over salary actions at the college level, salary and benefit projections are

delayed until after the previous month's payroll costs have been posted to the SAP system by the district. This has produced situations in which new employees have been hired and assigned prior to the confirmation of sufficient budgetary resources to support the position. Only when payroll records are posted is the college Business Office aware of the expenditure. Proper checks and balances should be implemented to assure congruence between human resources and fiscal actions. (III.D.2.c)

The LACCD uses an electronic campus and district system called SAP which has an integrated electronic approval system to ensure approval of expenditures as well as hiring and staffing assignments. For all college non-salary contracts, the final approval on the campus is with the president and the VP of Administrative Services, with the district providing oversight. The campus leaders meet regularly to review FTES and budget-to-actual reports. There is wide campus representation at these meetings. The district controller and staff from District Educational and Budget Offices also attend these meetings. There is a process defined in the Planning Policy and Procedures Manual that explicitly states that all grant applications and expenditures will be implemented through the college planning process and reflects the stated mission and goals. The Grant Policies and Procedures Manual is used when LAHC explores grant opportunities. (III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e)

The college has no contractual authority except as delegated by specific actions by the Board of Trustees in accordance with Board rules, chancellor's regulations and administrative procedures governing contracting. The District Contracts Office makes sure all contract language is in the best interest of the district and college. Final sign-off on all contracts lies at the college with the president and vice president of administrative services. The Grants Policy and Procedure Manual states that all grants must be aligned with the mission statement of the college. Before a grant application can be submitted it is vetted through the Grant Task Force Committee which is comprised of all constituencies on campus. (III.D.2.f)

Each college is required to submit a monthly financial plan update and quarterly reports to the chancellor. Contingency plans are also required given the current economic conditions with the state. These plans provide for five, ten and 15 percent reductions to current funding. The District Internal Audit unit regularly performs internal audits to review processes for compliance with district internal controls and policies and procedures. The college Vice President of Administrative Services Council and the district office business staff are currently updating the Business Procedure Manual. (III.D.2.g)

The College Budget Committee is responsible for assessing the effective use of college financial resources as a basis for improvement. Beginning in fall 2011 a task force of the District Budget Committee, called the District Budget Executive Committee, began meeting weekly to assess institutional expenditure patterns and will forward recommendations to the Budget Committee and to the CPC for integration in future college planning documents. (III.D.3)

## **Conclusions**

In the aftermath of discovering evidence of mismanagement in the implementation of the construction bonds, the district underwent both internal and state audits to identify areas for remediation. In response to the identified problems, the district created positions within its management structure to ensure better oversight. The district also imposed a temporary moratorium on construction projects as a means to evaluate construction plans going forward. The district should actively and regularly review the effectiveness of the oversight structure 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.

The district's 2011 financial audit and management letter, due in December of 2011, is overdue. The district's 2010 financial audit and management letter note a number of significant findings related to federal and state awards, among other issues. In order to ensure the financial integrity of the district and the colleges, the resolution of the material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit should be fully effected by the completion of next year's audit, and appropriate systems should be implemented and maintained to prevent future audit exceptions.

In response to a Commission Concern first communicated in 2008 and reiterated in 2009 and 2010, the Los Angeles Community College District LACCD established a plan to: 1) to fund the medical retiree benefits on the pay-as-you-go basis, and 2) to fund the ARC (annual required contribution) partially at 82%. To date, the district has not fully funded the ARC as planned. As a consequence, the concern for long-term financial solvency and the potential for significant out-year impact on the general operating funds of the District and its colleges persist.

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 in of short- and long-term financial planning for the district and the colleges, the district should 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.

LAHC is committed to using its fiscal resources in alliance with its campus wide planning documents. The college, even with severe financial constraints, has indicated that it is committed to making decisions based on their institutional planning, although there is little evidence to support this assertion.

The college partially meets Standard III.D.

## **Recommendations**

### **College Recommendations:**

See College Recommendation 1.

3. In order to meet the Standard, and to adequately monitor salary and benefit expenditures to insure that the institution practices effective oversight of finances, the team

recommends that salary actions should first be reviewed for adequate funding prior to initiating the employment process. (III.D.2.d)

### **District Recommendations:**

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. (III.B.1.a, III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
2. In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, and to ensure the financial integrity of the district and the colleges, 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. (III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
3. In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend the district adhere to the annual required contribution (ARC) guidelines and closely monitor the planned process. (III.D.1.c, IV.B.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
4. In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, 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, 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. (III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c, IV.B.3.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)

## **Standard IV - Leadership and Governance**

### **A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes**

#### **General Observations**

LAHC has been a viable part of its community since opening its doors as "Harbor Tech" in 1949 to 649 students. In 2010-2011, the college welcomed a new president, served 10,511 students, balanced its budget for the first time since the implementation of the new funding model, and for the first time, based program reviews on the results of data from service area and student learning outcomes.

In its presentation of Standard IV, LAHC recognizes and reinforces a strong commitment to broad participation of all constituency groups in the governance of the college.

As a college in the largest multi-college district in the state, LAHC has a well-developed sense of its identity and the college and district have clearly delineated the roles and responsibilities of each. Based on feedback indicating a need, improvement in communication has been a high priority for both the chancellor and the president, and both have implemented positive changes to increase opportunities and quality of interactions within the college, with the community the college serves, and with the district.

## **Findings and Evidence**

LAHC's decision-making process has been operational now for ten years. In this process, individual members of each unit of the college contribute to the development of annual unit plans, which are submitted to the principle decision-making body of the college, the College Planning Council (CPC). The three Clusters (Academic Affairs, Administrative, and Student Services) merge unit plans into cluster plans and CPC merges these cluster plans into the College Annual Plan. College leadership has worked within this governance structure to ensure adequate representation of the four constituency groups of the college: administration, faculty, classified staff, and students. The College Planning Policy and Procedures Manual contains a comprehensive listing of college governance committees and councils and defines the areas in which each constituency group has involvement and authority. Numerous interviews confirmed that the content of the manual and the CPC planning processes are functional; college-wide representation is ensured; and strategic planning and budget allocation issues are discussed in an open and inclusive environment. Meeting agendas and minutes of CPC and subcommittees of CPC are published via the web or sent via email to all the college-wide email to which administrators, faculty, staff and students have access.

In the Self-Evaluation Report, CPC committed to conducting a "Communication Audit" to address communication issues that were identified and propose solutions to these issues. The team encourages CPC to conduct this audit. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

The partnership of faculty leadership and administrative support is evidenced in the College Planning Policy and Procedures Manual, the participatory governance document, Administrative Regulations E-64 and E-65, and in interviews with CPC members, Academic Senate leaders, and academic administrators. Although outdated (the current version on the web was approved in 2001 and needs to be updated to reflect current committees of the Senate and the college), the Academic Senate Constitution clearly delineates the responsibilities, structures, and procedures of the Senate with respect to academic and professional matters. However, this document is outdated and the team encourages the Academic Senate to update their constitution to reflect current responsibilities, structures and procedures at the college. The Senate leadership meets regularly with the president and participates in all college committees. Interviews with the Academic Senate president and the college president confirmed how faculty involvement in governance processes and discussions on campus have been vital to decision-making at LAHC. (IV.A.2.b)

Chancellor's Directive No. 70 delineates roles of constituency groups in the governance process for the district. LAHC's "Participatory Governance Document" defines college participatory governance roles and responsibilities and mandates the participation of each constituency group on CPC. In response to expressions from some students and classified staff members of difficulty in participating effectively in participatory governance of the college, a College Hour was initiated, and the president implemented vision summit meetings, open forums, and brown-bag lunches. In addition, CPC further defined its decision-making process as a consensus model and is currently pursuing parliamentary procedures for use when consensus cannot be reached. Data used in decision making is distributed college wide. Minutes from CPC, Academic Senate meetings, and numerous other committees are posted to the college Web-site or sent to all constituency groups via email. To further encourage participation of all constituency groups, the college committed to holding committee meetings to the shortest time possible. This is accomplished by detailed agendas and prior distribution of handouts. The team saw evidence of this commitment and even observed a CPC meeting that ended early. (IVA3)

The documents referenced in the Self-Evaluation Report, proactive responses to each of the communications from ACCJC since the 2006 Accreditation visit, and interviews with numerous campus leaders reveal an institutional frankness, honesty and integrity in LAHC's interactions. This includes its interface with the college's recent notification of the Commission acceptance of its March 2010 Follow-up Report. (IV.A.4)

The College's Participatory Governance Document was designed with the intent of giving "all participants who are affected by decisions the opportunity to effectively participate in the decision-making process." This document is scheduled to be reviewed every two years and then approved by the CPC. After approval by CPC, each CPC representative affirms agreement with the revisions to the final document on a separate signature page. During the current review cycle, the process was delayed due to the inability for all constituency groups to come to agreement. Continued discussion and consensus building resulted in a revised document coming for CPC approval later this month. This example demonstrates that opinions of all constituency groups are respected. Sharing of minutes via the web and email ensure college wide knowledge of the biannual review. (IV.A.5)

The college meets Standard IV.A.

## **Recommendations**

None

## **B. Board and Administrative Organization**

### **General Observations**

LACCD clearly defines the organizational roles of the district and the colleges. The LACCD Board of Trustees is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services for the 9 colleges of the district. The Board is also responsible for the financial stability of the institution and for selecting and evaluating its chief administrative officer.

The president of LAHC has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. His areas of responsibilities include planning, organizing, budgeting, and assessing institutional effectiveness. He is also responsible for selecting and developing personnel.

LAHC is making progress in resolving the fiscal integrity of the institution. Upon taking office in August 2010, the president's top priority was to balance the college's budget. To these ends, he established a "Budget Workgroup" in fall 2011 and charged it with developing budget principles and an implementation plan for budget reductions. To further strengthen this commitment, a Dean of Economic and Workforce Development was hired in July 2011 to prepare grant proposals and monitor grant administration. The president also re-energized the Foundation Board to renew its fundraising efforts for the college.

The administration of the LACCD provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district. It also provides support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district and acts as the liaison between the district and the governing board.

## **Findings and Evidence**

The LACCD has revised the functional map that describes the roles of the Board of Trustees and its committees, the functions and membership of 46 district wide governance and administrative committees and a definition of the functional relationship between the district and the nine colleges.

Since 2009, ongoing steps have been taken to engage faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in a dialog on the mutual roles and responsibilities of the colleges and the district system. They have produced a District Governance and Functions Handbook which is reviewed and revised on a two-year cycle.

The Board of Trustees has established policies to assure the quality, integrity and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services, and the financial stability of the district and the colleges. There are four standing committees which inform the Board and enable it to monitor the educational quality of LACCD programs: 1) Institutional Effectiveness Committee, 2) Finance and Audit Committee, 3) Legislative Committee, and 4) Capital Construction Committee. The board policy and practice for evaluating the chancellor is a written policy, Directive #122. (IV.B.1)

The Governing Board of LACCD has seven publicly-elected members and one student member elected district wide. In visits with LAHC, personnel expressed concern that the at-large election of trustees does not result in equal representation for all of the colleges, and smaller colleges are likely to suffer. Also, the current system which provides the election of one student trustee for the 9 colleges does not ensure steady student participation. A recent experience saw the student trustee resign due to personal issues and there was not a clear process to identify a new student trustee. After two months, a student was nominated and accepted as a student trustee, but this is

perceived to be ineffective since there is little time for orientation and development. This Board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in its activities and decisions. The trustees support Board decisions as a whole and defend the institution from undue pressures. The Board completed an evaluation in February 2012 and the Administrator Group and Resource Table group rated the Board as “poorly committed” in two areas 1) consideration of pertinent background information and chancellor’s recommendations when making policy decisions, and 2) concentration on policy information and revision, rather than focusing on administrative/procedural operations. Interviews of district and college staff revealed an inconsistent practice of the Board of Trustees in terms of its communication through the chancellor or his designee to district and college staff. A perception exists that the Board of Trustees fails to consistently operate at the policy level of governance, and perceived incidents of micromanagement by the Board of Trustees of district operations were frequent. (IV.B.1.a)

The governing board has established policies consistent with the Mission Statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services as well as the resources necessary to support them. Oversight of the colleges' programs is maintained by means of board rules and administrative regulations that establish graduation standards, set policies for curriculum development and approval, and detail the faculty's central role in educational matters. The Board periodically reviews and approves the colleges' mission and vision statements. The college presidents are required to give quarterly reports on the colleges' budgets to the Board. The Board played a central role in promoting three bond measures; these have brought \$5.7 billion of capital construction funds for campus based project to the LACCD. The district has valued sustainability with solar power generation on each campus; also, 85 new structures will meet LEED standards. (IV.B.1.b)

The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. Four standing committees are integral in the Board's ability to fulfill this responsibility: 1) the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (formerly called “Student Success Committee”) addresses issues of educational effectiveness, student achievement and educational programs, 2) the Finance and Audit Committee reviews and recommends adoption of the tentative budget and also reviews and recommends acceptance of the annual audits; the Finance and Audit Committee also reviews financial reports, internal audit reports, information on bond financing, and considers revenue generating plans including the development of public/private partnerships, 3) the Legislative Committee reviews proposed state and federal legislative initiatives and makes recommendations for the benefit of the district, and 4) the Capital Construction Committee acts as a public forum for presentations on college master plans and allows for discussion on compliance with sustainability and energy goals. The District Budget Committee also advises the Board and recommends a district budget allocation model, monitors the district and college finances and provides periodic updates regarding LACCD finances.

The Board sets goals and provides direction for the colleges through its District Strategic Plan. Last year the District Planning Committee engaged faculty, students, classified staff, and administrators in the development of Vision 2017, a five year plan that will be presented to the governing board in May 2012. (IV.B.1.c)

The financial integrity of the district's multi-billion dollar capital construction project has necessitated tighter management; the Board has approved the creation of an independent Office of the Inspector General responsible for on-going review of performance, financial integrity, and legal compliance. The most recent audit was "unqualified" but findings regarding the funding of retired employee benefits remain. (IV.B.1.c)

The governing board duties are defined by State Ed Code and board rules. Chancellor's Directive Number 70, District wide Internal Management Consultation Process defines the process for adoption of board rules and administrative regulations. Regular review and revision are considered for adoption at board meetings. Administrative Regulation C-12 stipulates the process for triennial review of all policies and regulations; this is the responsibility of the chancellor's designee. Recent policy changes have included allowing adjunct faculty to serve on presidential selection committees, delegating authority to college presidents to manage Child Development Centers, as well as changes in district and faculty hiring procedures. Policies and bylaws are posted on the district website; however, many of these have not been reviewed for some time. The team suggests a systematic review of board rules, and revision where appropriate. (IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e)

As stated in Board Rule 2105, new Board members, including the student trustee, are provided an orientation. The annual Board self-evaluation process includes feedback from college presidents, district senior staff, academic senate and union representatives. New Board goals are established at the annual retreat. The Board adopted a District Effectiveness Review Cycle to align board and CEO goals with District Strategic Plan. (IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.g)

The board adopted a Statement of Ethical Values and Code of Ethical Conduct (Board Rule 2300) which defines expectations for each member to demonstrate honesty, integrity, reliability and loyalty. Additionally there is a process for sanctioning behavior (Board Rule 2300.11) that violates the code. Board members are informed of the accreditation process during the new member orientation, and also through work with the Board's Institutional Effectiveness Committee which monitors the self-evaluation process of the nine colleges. There is a District Liaison for Accreditation who reports directly to the vice chancellor of institutional effectiveness and keeps the Board apprised of accreditation issues, the liaison, along with the vice chancellor, meet with faculty accreditation chairs to assist and share information. District colleges approach accreditation self-evaluations as an integral part of strategic planning. (IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.1.i)

Board policy identifies employment procedures for the chancellor as well as procedures for annual performance evaluation. Recent evaluation completed in May 2011, prior to renewal of contract. The chancellor and the Board share responsibility for hiring and evaluating vice chancellors, college presidents and the general counsel. The chancellor is responsible for the evaluation of college presidents and the process is defined in written policy. (IV.B.1.j)

LAHC's president has demonstrated effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. In an effort to increase opportunities for input and participation, the president instituted two "summit" meetings and invited the entire college community to participate. Over 150 faculty staff and students participated in these events to establish a "strategic vision" for the College Master Plan at the first summit, and to assess accreditation progress at the second. The president also participates in committee meetings to discuss issues openly with the college constituency groups. In addition,

he meets regularly with leadership from each constituency group and has implemented open forums and “brown bag lunches” for less formal interaction with faculty, staff and students. Finally, the president initiated and participated in the first annual CPC planning retreat where he worked with CPC to clearly delineate its scope and procedures and to institute an evaluation process. The president has delegated authority to the other college administrators consistent with their responsibilities and evaluates their effectiveness as prescribed by the union contract for dean level and below and according to the prescribed procedure for vice presidents. (IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a)

The college’s president is guiding the institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment in accordance with the standards prescribed by the Commission. Through his accessibility, collaborative approach and commitment to inclusiveness, the president has improved the college climate and culture. In numerous interviews, meetings and forums the team heard enthusiastic commendations of president’s leadership from administration, faculty, staff and students.

Upon coming into office the president committed to strengthen and support the data-driven planning model already in place at LAHC. To these ends, he integrated college research and planning into a single Office of Institutional Effectiveness. This office provides data for use in managerial unit plans, which reflect the results of assessment of SLO’s and SAO’s. These unit plans are then merged into “Cluster Plans” by the Administrative, Student Services and Academic Affairs Clusters and then the College Planning Council (CPC) uses these cluster plans to make recommendations to the president about the allocation of resources, applications for external funding and the pursuit of partnerships opportunities. As a voting member of the Executive Committee of the DBC, the president has a voice in ensuring the equitable distribution of district funds through the revision of the District Budget Allocation Model. (IV.B.2.b)

The president reviews new statutes, regulations, Chancellor’s Directives and Trustee Rules at weekly senior staff meetings. When there is an institutional or area impact of these statutes, regulations, directives or rules, the president consults with appropriate college leadership (i.e., Academic Senate, ASO, CPC) for review and to assure that the college’s practices are consistent with them. (IV.B.2.c)

The president created an ad hoc budget subcommittee to recommend a set of budgeting principles and an implementation plan for budget reductions. This committee has met weekly since fall 2011 and submitted a plan to deal with the decrease in state funding that was congruent with the Chancellor’s Guidelines and Principles which were enacted in March 2011. The subcommittee’s budget plans have been approved by CPC and the college president and will be used to balance the 2012-2013 budget. Since July 2011, when a Dean of Economic and Workforce Development was hired, the college has been awarded over \$6 million in federal and state grants. The president has also devoted time to the rejuvenation of LAHC’s Foundation Board to generate funds to support of college programs and student scholarships. (IV.B.2.d)

The president has built goodwill and opened lines of communication with the external community through establishing partnerships with the Port of Los Angeles, PortTech Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, City of Los Angeles and elected officials. The president also sits on the Board of the Hispanic Association of Colleges

and Universities (HACU) and will be accompanying 6 students to the national HACU conference in Washington, D.C. this spring. The president has also increased internal and external communication through the use of social media such as Facebook and Twitter, email, the college website, and publications entitled “Harbor Happenings” and “Report to the Community 2010-2011.” (VI.B.2.e)

Through a collaborative effort involving faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders and including the following four components: 1) a review and revision of district office service outcomes; 2) and update of district wide committee descriptions; 3) expansion of the functional map; and 4) implementation of a survey to assess the accuracy of the current definitions of the district/college relationship; a new 2010 LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook was developed. It provides employees with a more accurate and informed understanding of the district’s role in relation to the colleges. This handbook is reviewed and revised on a two-year cycle and the first revision was completed in spring 2012. (IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a)

The district maintains administrative functions that are for efficiency and/or effectiveness best delivered centrally. In its 2006-2011 strategic plan, the district set a goal of the development of a district wide “culture of service and accountability” and instituted customer satisfaction surveys to assess their effectiveness in this endeavor. Based on the results of these surveys, the district implements revisions to its services, and includes input from the colleges in making these revisions. Examples of such responses to the colleges are: conversion to the SAP payroll system, creation of the Employee Service Center, and upgrading of the college website. Due to concerns expressed on campus about district services and attention to college calendars and needs, the team encourages the district to continue to solicit college feedback on quality, timeliness and delivery of services. The team also encourages that the district to consider the use of telecommunications for district wide meetings when possible. (IV.B.3.b)

In 2007 the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (DBC) reviewed the district’s budget allocation and funding mechanisms and adopted a new budget allocation model based on FTES with a \$500,000 augmentation to the four small colleges in the district. In March 2012 the Executive Committee of DBC revised the district allocation formula again, resulting in a base allocation increase from 12% to 17%, thus giving an additional \$655,000 to LAHC for FY 2012-2013. In addition, due to the district-wide budget shortfall in 2011-2012, the DBC issued recommendations to the colleges to help them establish balanced budgets and authorized the suspension of college debt repayments for both 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. See Standard III for a recommendation regarding a timelier implementation of the budget allocation model. (IV.B.3.c)

The District effectively controls its expenditures by a) working with the 9 Colleges to set enrollment targets; b) mandating that all college presidents and all vice chancellors develop and monitor their budgets and file quarterly fiscal reports following the standards of good practice in the Operating Standards and Measures for Monitoring and Assessment of College Fiscal Conditions; c) establishing district-wide budget guidelines and principles for balancing the budget; and d) working with the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC) to control health benefits costs. However, LACCD has work to do in addressing its unfunded liability for retirees’ health care. See Standard IIID1c. (IV.B.3.d)

The chancellor has delegated the full responsibility and authority to the college's president to implement and administer the college in accordance with district policies without the chancellor's interference and, though monthly reports and annual reviews, holds the president accountable for the operation of the college. (IV.B.3.e)

The chancellor and district staff members act as the liaison between the college and the Board of Trustees, although the president is present at and takes part in the Board of Trustees meetings. College constituents feel well-represented on district committees and councils. The chancellor has implemented measures to improve communication between the district and the colleges. The team encourages continued attention to district and college website development and maintenance. (IV.B.3.f)

As evidence of the relationship between district and college, the College Governance Agreement and the Planning Policies and Procedures Manual detail respective roles in planning and budget development. The District Governance and Function Handbook clearly delineates the opportunities for all constituency groups to participate in the district governance and planning processes in the following ways: direct consultation, representation on district-level governance committees, involvement in "the internal management consultation process," and participation in the human resource guide development process. The DPC implemented an annual evaluation of each district shared governance committee and widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement. Results of these evaluations are also presented to the Board as a part of the annual review of district's effectiveness. (IV.b.3.g)

## **Conclusions**

There is mutual respect amongst the constituency groups at LAHC. Many opportunities are in place for open dialogue and measures are in place to ensure that all constituency groups are represented and respected in these venues. There is a culture of participatory governance that is encouraged by college leadership and respected by administration, faculty, staff and students.

The CPC is the focal point of the college governance. All constituency groups are represented on CPC. This entity is the chief decision-making body of the college and is responsible for ensuring implementation of the college's planning documents and budget processes.

More than half of the LACCD Board is relatively new to the role. Concerns were expressed at the campus and revealed through the March 2012 Board Evaluation Report that they are still developing in their leadership and policy making role in support of the chancellor.

The Board of Trustees is inconsistent in terms of its communication through the chancellor or his designee to district and college staff. A perception exists that the Board of Trustees fails to consistently operate at the policy level of governance, and perceived incidents of micromanagement by the Board of Trustees of district operations are frequent. Board of Trustees should make visible, in behavior and in decision-making, their policy role and their responsibility to act as a whole in the public's interest. Continuing professional development for the Board of Trustees should be provided to ensure a full understanding of the board's role in

policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the chancellor or his designee.

The college president is well respected and has taken steps in his short tenure to address issues identified in previous accreditation cycles as well as from more current survey data. Examples of his proactive approach to leadership are: 1) the establishment of the two summit meetings; 2) participation in college committees; 3) active involvement in the community; 4) rejuvenation of the LAHC Foundation; and 5) a cooperative approach to developing sound budget principles to lead to a balanced budget.

## **Recommendations**

### **College Recommendation:**

None

### **District Recommendations:**

See District Recommendation 1.

See District Recommendation 2.

See District Recommendation 3.

See District Recommendation 4.

**District Recommendation 5:** In order 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 full understanding of its role in policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the chancellor or his designee. (IV.B.1.a)