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Summary of Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Harbor College

DATES OF VISIT: March 20-23, 2006

TEAM CHAIR: Frank Chong, Ed.D
President, Mission College

A 12 member accreditation team visited Los Angeles Harbor College from March 20-23, 2006, for the purposes of determining whether the institution continues to meet accreditation standards by evaluating how well the College is meeting its stated purposes, analyzing how well the College is meeting the Commission standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all day team training session on February 3, 2006 conducted by ACCJC. The team studied the Commission Handbook on Evaluators, and was divided into four sub-groups, according to the standards. Team members also carefully read the College’s self study (including the recommendations from the 2000 accreditation team) and related documents provided by Los Angeles Harbor College.

In general, the self study report contained most of the elements required by the Commission. It was evident that the College was well prepared for the visiting team during our pre-visit in January. The Chair and the Team Assistant were extremely impressed with the responsiveness of the President and Accreditation Co-Chairs in addressing our concerns for the visit. Additionally, the faculty, administration and classified leadership were totally accessible and responsive.

Prior to arriving on campus, each team member submitted written reactions to the self study and identified inquiries to be made during the visit to the Team Chair. Four team members of the LAHC team met on March 19 and attended meetings arranged with District to better understand District office functions and their relationship to the Colleges being evaluated.

On March 20, the entire team arrived in San Pedro and met together for a three-hour meeting to collectively review the self study report and finalize questions and requests for visits during the next three days.
During the next three days, the team met collectively or individually with over 100 College faculty, classified staff, administrators, students and governing Board members. Moreover, the team held two widely publicized, well-attended open forums that were open to all members of the community. The team appreciated the honesty and candor of the employees and students throughout the visit.
MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2006 TEAM

The following recommendations are made as a result of the March 20-23, 2006 Team visit:

1. The team recommends that as part of its assessment of its evaluation mechanism, the College should revisit and revise as necessary the current instructional program review process and review it for effectiveness in improving instructional programs based in evidence that is relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable using District/College institutional research data (not program self-developed data) and that a key measure of program success be its response to discipline, cluster, and College developed SLOs. The team suggests that the review and revision of the instructional program review process should be completed with sufficient time to allow review and confirmation that the College has an operational and sustainable instructional program review process as evidenced by completed program review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. Further the College program review policy and procedure manual should reflect the key and decisive role of the administration of the College in the decisions effecting scheduling of courses and the continuance/discontinuance of programs (IB, IB1, IB3, IB4, IB5, IB6, IB7, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2f, IIA6b, IVB.2).

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 (IB1).

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. The team suggests that the College revisit the Commission’s definition of dialogue and description of Shaping the Dialogue for assistance. (IB1, IB2, IB4, IIA1c).

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).

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

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)
COMMENDATIONS FOR LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE

1. The College should be commended for the significant progress in developing and implementing a collegial participatory governance process.

   It was evident throughout our visit that there was active participation of all of the College’s constituents. The team was particularly impressed with the active involvement of students in ASB.

2. The College should be commended for its impressive data and research gathering.

   The Los Angeles Harbor Fact Book was clear, comprehensive and presented in a user-friendly format. The Fact Book was viewed as model for all community Colleges.

3. The College should be commended on its progress since the last accreditation visit.

   Its governance system is clear and functioning as intended. The planning process, while needing improvement as described above, is still significantly improved over the 2000 visit.

4. The College should also be commended on its program review process.

   Despite the team’s concerns with the processes the College should be acknowledged for bringing such a process into being. Discussions with institutional representatives showed a vision of the future for program review that would address many of the concerns expressed.
Introduction

Los Angeles Harbor College is one of the nine Colleges that comprise of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). The College is located approximately 22 miles south of the city of Los Angeles. The College primarily serves the communities of San Pedro, Harbor City, Harbor Gateway, and Wilmington. It also serves the cities of Carson, Gardena, Lomita, Palos Verdes Estates, Rancho Palo Verdes, Rolling Hills, And some parts Long Beach and Redondo Beach.

The College was founded in 1949 as Harbor Tech, a two-year technical institute modeled on L.A. Trade Tech, with an initial enrollment of 649 students. The enrollment steadily grew and peaked at 12,541 students in 1985. Since then the enrollment has steadily declined to its present size of approximately 8,500 students. The College employs more than 450 persons, both full time and part-time staff. In FY 2005-06, the general fund budget was $23.6 Million with an additional $7.8 million in grant funded programs.

Since the last accreditation visit in March of 2000, the campus has changed considerably. With the passage of two successive bond measures, Los Angeles Harbor College is undergoing a major new and reconstruction of its existing campus. Construction has begun on campus and is clearly evident when walking around the campus.
Team Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2000 Recommendations

I. Response to Previous Team Recommendations

The evaluation team which visited Los Angeles Harbor College March 14-16, 2000, applied the 1996 ACCJC standards of accreditation. Following the visit the College was asked to submit an Interim Report focusing on two recommendations:

1. Participatory governance: The team strongly recommends that the College and the District accomplish the recommendation of the 1994 evaluation team to develop a system of participatory governance that is inclusive in membership and results in a collaborative process that produces results. Policies, practices, and expectations should be clarified and communicated so that all constituencies will understand what they can expect from each other in an environment of effective participation and mutual respect (Standard 10B.5, 10B.6, 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10)

2. Comprehensive Master Plan: The team strongly recommends that the College and the District accomplish the recommendation of the 1994 evaluation team to develop a comprehensive Education and Facilities Master Plan. The team further recommends that the College develop and implement an integrated educational, technologies, facilities, and human resource planning process supported by campus-wide program review and institutional research outcomes. (Standard 1.3, 3A, 3B, 3C, 4D.1, 5.10, 6.7, 8.5, and 9A)

Los Angeles Harbor College’s submitted its Interim Report in November 2001. This report, and that of the Interim Evaluation Team, was accepted by the Commission with the request that the College’s Midterm Report provide evidence that the governance process continues to be effective.

The College submitted its mid-term report October 17, 2002. In its response, the Commission: “... commends the College for its serious efforts to address the issues of planning and governance, as well as its forthright evaluation of its progress in addressing all recommendations” and, “urges the College to institutionalize those processes that will serve its stated interest in the success of students and the inclusion of all people on campus as a requisite for governance and planning.”

In summary, the College has energetically and substantially fulfilled recommendation one: Participatory governance. The College has made progress on recommendation two: Comprehensive Master Plan but, as will be noted below, has significant work to complete.
Reports of the four standards and related recommendations are as follows:

Standard I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

General Observations

In revising the Accreditation Standards (Adopted June 2002), the Commission reinforced the direct link between Institutional Mission and Effectiveness in Standard I, noting, the institutional mission provides the impetus for achieving student learning and other goals that the institution endeavors to accomplish. The institution provides the means for students to learn, assesses how well learning is occurring, and strives to improve the learning through on-going systematic, and integrated planning. Although the standards are presented in four parts, they work together to facilitate institution-wide dialogue on the institution’s effectiveness. The institutional self study provides the Commission with the institution’s assessment of itself as a whole. The Commission asks the visiting team to use the self study report to acquire, through interviews, meetings, direct observation and examination of written evidence, enough information to support a professional judgment that the institution meets or exceeds the standards.

As will be described in more detail, the team did not find evidence that Los Angeles Harbor College had fully integrated the two parts (mission and institutional effectiveness) contained in Standard I. In an attempt to assist the College in identifying where action is needed, the Findings and Evidence, Conclusions, and Recommendations sections of this report have been delineated by Standard I.A (Mission) and Standard I.B (Institutional Effectiveness). The College is cautioned to use these delineations only for clarity in receiving the team’s findings and with the understanding that the College is expected to integrate the two.

A. Mission

General Observations

The self study describes opportunity for College wide participation in the development of the College’s mission statement. The wording Student Learning Outcomes has been included in the mission statement although the full mission statement is more focused on environment than on what the student achieves while in the environment. The team notes that the environment focus in the College mission statement reflects similar emphasis in the District statement. The College identifies the mission statement as a central piece in its institutional planning and decision-making process by requiring unit plan objectives to be tied to specific Goals and Strategies in the College strategic plan.
**Findings and Evidence**

Review of the Mission Statement and meeting minutes shows that the College has taken initiative to develop and sustain programs and services central to its mission. However, the team observed that the mission statement is more focused on what the College does as opposed to what the students do and learn. (IA1)

The team found a clear mission statement that has been revised, as requested, since the last accreditation visit and published by the College. The self study questions the level of College-wide awareness of the mission and recommends more campus-wide awareness of the mission and the College governance planning process. The self study reports that the mission statement has been reviewed twice within the College’s governance process supported by College planning committee meeting minutes indicating the last review in March 2005. The self study reports that the College mission is approved by the Board of Trustees as an integral to the planning process. When the team requested a dated copy or an approval date referenced in the self study, the College was not able to provide either. The team subsequently learned that although the College had forwarded the mission statement for approval, it had not been approved. The president is following up with the Board of Trustees office to rectify this omission. (IA2, IA3, IA4)

**Conclusions**

The College meets the Standard I expectation that the College uses its Mission Statement to guide its planning and decision making, and survey data verified this fact. (IA.4)

**Recommendations**

None.
II. Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The self study describes opportunity for College wide participation in the development of the strategic plan, and a College-wide planning and resource allocation processes. The College’s planning process includes annual unit plans prioritized into the four main College cluster plans and approved by the College Planning Committee (CPC) funds permitting. Additionally the College has developed a multi-year program review cycle with instructional plans submitted to and approved by the Academic Senate.

The planning and resource allocation process appears weighted to planning/resource seeking and lighter on evaluation. The team also found that the annual unit plans and cluster plans are limited to supporting requests for new monies. The team did not find evidence that unit plans and resulting cluster plans were responsive to decreasing resources. It is unclear to the team how the pieces of evaluation become whole in assessment of the institution’s effectiveness.

The team has concerns that the realization of the themes of Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement and Organization that weave throughout the standards providing definition of quality institutions are lacking at Los Angeles Harbor College. The team did not find a culture of ongoing and systematic cycles of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation, nor did the team find the organizational means to identify and make public the learning outcomes, to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in producing those outcomes, and to make improvement.

Findings and Evidence

There are three key expectations in this standard: 1) infusion of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), 2) use of data for analysis of student performance and institutional effectiveness, based in these outcomes, and 3) change, improvement, based on review of the above in a climate of ongoing, collegial, and reflective dialogue.

The team notes that there is an expectation that SLOs be incorporated into curriculum outlines and that they be considered in the unit plan phase of the strategic planning process. The visiting team recognizes that training seminars, brochures, and opening day programs facilitated by the College and the District have focused on SLOs and notes that College leadership has made efforts to assist the faculty in coming to grips with SLOs and their implementation.

But while discussion is encouraged and expected, the team found that the primary purpose of SLOs, i.e. cross-programmatic and inter-programmatic dialogue about student learning, appears absent. The team was encouraged that individual departments have
found discussions about SLO and curriculum change useful, but the team would like to see where each unit and each cluster has met and designed cross-unit and cross-cluster SLOs with a common rubric for assessing student progress leading up to institution-wide SLOs. Absent this step, the intention of SLOs goes unfulfilled. (IB1, IB2, IB4)

Data is key to SLO assessment and any planning process. The team did not find consistent evidence that data provided for the College planning and assessment process was integrated or even given response. Based on the lack of a culture of using data, the team questions the validity and effectiveness, in particular the program review process, which the College identifies as the cornerstone of the College assessment process. (IB3, IB5)

The College does not suffer from a lack of data. Data meeting the Commissions standards of good evidence are available. The College institutional research office has compiled and made public on the College website, an annual College “fact book” containing student achievement and assessment data key to guiding the planning and assessment processes. Through interviews with faculty and administrators, the team sensed a reluctance to use course and programmatic data for instructional programmatic decision-making. The self study planning agenda recommends filing a full time-researcher position. The College and the team are hopeful that filling the position will assist in forwarding the College’s research agenda. (IB2, IB3, IB5, IB6, IB7)

The College has made great strides since the 2000 visit in further developing its planning process and producing a two-year strategic plan. The attempts and advancement in integrating various planning activities are impressive. The goals are published and considered within other parts of the planning process. However, while it is recognized that the process has a way to go, the work to date addresses the primary concern expressed on this point by the 2000 visiting team. (IB2, IB4)

The College Strategic Planning process establishes goals to improve effectiveness; however, the team notes that not all key performance indicator measures are stated in measurable terms and that most goals and strategies focus on offering an environment – what the College does rather than what the student learns. The development of the strategic plan involves a planning cycle that provides multiple opportunities for informed input. With unit planning, cluster committees and the College Planning Council, it would appear there is adequate opportunity for input. In the Fall 2004 Campus Climate Survey, 68% of respondents felt that they were “somewhat” or “very aware” of the College’s strategic goals, and that there had been a decided increase in College commitment to the dissemination of planning data.” The self study reports that 90% of those responding say they were involved in College planning but 28% were not happy with the process. The team would encourage the College to follow up on its planning agenda by examining its communication conduits such as the website, email, etc. to maximize awareness and engagement in the process. (IB2, IB4)
The team did not find evidence that the planning process provides an assessment and analysis leading to increased institutional effectiveness. The team did not find evidence of the inclusion of an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Neither institutional effectiveness nor program evaluation appears to be based on a deep analysis of data. Although the research office compiles key performance indicators and they are discussed in the College Planning Committee, the College does not engage in College wide dialogue. Given the budget stress the College is under, it would seem that creating planning and assessment processes that lead to increased effectiveness is essential. (IB3, IB4, IB6, IB7)

A review of the program review process through review of written procedures and on site interviews raised a team concern about the Faculty Senate role in program review and, when appropriate, program stop-out or discontinuance. As the instructional program planning process begins with the instructional program and then is forwarded to the Faculty Senate for final approval (i.e. no administrative action being taken, expected, or invited), then the only way programs are compelled to change or are eliminated is if they themselves propose it. This does not seem a likely circumstance and, therefore, calls the entire instructional program review process into question. Obviously broad input into program decisions is discouraged by this process. (IB3, IB4, IB5, IB6)

Interviews and review of written information shows that the allocation of funding is a major issue for the College. The College has experienced what the self study describes as excessive deficits tracing back to 1991 when the District modified its funding allocation model resulting in the College being under the financial oversight of a District wide allocation grant taskforce. Even though the College took the actions suggested by the taskforce, the deficit persists.

The team suggests that as an additional step to reducing the deficit the College might address more carefully some College service areas as well as the administrative structure as avenues for expense reduction. However, it is the team’s view that service and position reductions will not be sufficient to meet the expected/projected deficits in the coming years, and furthermore, the cuts and delays in filling staff, counseling, and faculty positions have already effected the College’s ability to fulfill its mission as reported by staff and students in the open forums. The District allocation model needs review with an eye to addressing the special needs of the smaller Colleges. (IB4, IVB3)

The team is concerned that the focus on shortage of funds has short-circuited a number of useful discussions the College should be having. As an outcome of the funding shortage, the College has limited long-range planning and is focus on what more nearly resembles operational plans based on the funding it expects to receive. The team found that the annual unit plans are frequently contingent on new/additional resources. This causes the team to question whether or not the lack of new resources brings program initiative to a stop as opposed to improving the program in as many ways as possible despite a shortage of resources. (IB3, IB4)
The newly negotiated governance process aids in reaching useful decisions. The planning process is helping in the creation of planning initiatives. The planning process needs to “close the loop” with assessment using data. It needs to use the outcome of this analysis for institutional improvement and communicate its analysis and plans throughout the College and to the public. The team did not find evidence that the College has a formal policy/process to review the effectiveness of its planning process cycle. (IB5, IB5a, IB5b, IB5c, IB6, IB7)

The lack of coordination between planning, assessment, and improvement is noted above. However, it should also be noted that the annual unit plans are a vehicle for program improvement and that program review, limited as it may be, is used to influence discipline planning. Some, very few, disciplines are using data and data analysis for the discipline planning. Unit plans are the key process for acquiring new resources and for program expansion. These requests are processed through the units and the clusters and through the CPC for a final recommendation to the president. So while on a College-wide basis planning and assessment needs improvement at the discipline planning level there is a process that is functional although it needs improvement in the infusion of data and assessment of results. The team found evidence of many, albeit disconnected or loosely connected, planning processes. The challenge for the College is to bring all of these activities together into one overarching institutional planning process - the whole needs to be greater than the sum of the parts. (IB2, IB3, IB7)

**Conclusions**

The College does not fully meet Standard I.B. Los Angeles Harbor College’s program review process is of concern to the team. In general, these reviews seem disconnected and unresponsive to data and to Student Learning Outcomes. Analysis of provided information is superficial and the impact of the Program Reviews on program planning or scheduling appears minimal, especially in the instructional areas. It appears that a full dialogue across the institution about the effectiveness of individual programs is not happening. Additionally the control of the instructional program discontinuance process by the Faculty Senate makes the institution unable to demand improvement from poor performing programs.

**Recommendations**

1. The team recommends that as part of its assessment of its evaluation mechanism, the College should revisit and revise as necessary the current instructional program review process and review it for effectiveness in improving instructional programs based in evidence that is relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable using District/College institutional research data (not program self-developed data) and that a key measure of program success be its response to discipline, cluster, and College developed SLOs. The team suggests that the review and revision of the instructional program review process should be completed with sufficient time to allow review and
confirmation that the College has an operational and sustainable instructional program review process as evidenced by completed program review cycles inclusive of all instructional programs. Further the College program review policy and procedure manual should reflect the key and decisive role of the administration of the College in the decisions effecting scheduling of courses and the continuance/discontinuance of programs (IB, IB1, IB3, IB4, IB5, IB6, IB7, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2f, IVB.2).

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 (IB1).

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. The team suggests that the College revisit the Commission’s definition of dialogue and description of Shaping the Dialogue for assistance. (IB1, IB2, IB4, IIA1c).

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).
Standard II – Student Learning Program and Services

General Observations

The Los Angeles Harbor College Self Study Report covers all relevant issues related to accreditation. All four standards are covered adequately and eligibility requirement are addressed clearly. This standard requires that the College assure academic integrity of the teaching and learning process and that the faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professional view.

The College catalog and publication address this clearly and adequately. The Academic Senate has endorsed the code of conduct proposed by the American Association of University Professors and approved by California Academic Senate. Student academic honestly policy is addressed in the College catalog. (IIA7 and IIA7a)

Findings and Evidence

Standard II covers three different areas; all related to student Learning Programs and Services. The first section (A) deals with instructional programs; Section (B) deals with student services and Section (C) relates to library and learning support services. Below is our analysis of each section.

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations

According to College Self Study, page 90, the Program Review process is the main mechanism through which compliance with this requirement can be accomplished. Further, the Self Study states that “The program initiation and viability procedures provided for the Program Review process are tools by which the College best selects the field of study in which it offers programs and ensures that its programs and curricula are current.” p. 90.

Findings and Evidence

The College Program Review process is confusing, even to College faculty and personnel. The Self Study refers to Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 Program Review. The College Web site dealing with accreditation provides information about Cycle 1 Program Review. However, during the campus visits many people on campus did not know anything about Cycle 1 Program Review. After several interviews, it was learned that Cycle 1 Program Review was mandated by the District in response to a planned reduction of low enrolled programs. Furthermore, Cycle 1 Program Review was discontinued in 2002. Yet, the self study refers to it as an ongoing process.
The structure of Program Review Cycle 2 is sound and comprehensive. The Program Review process was developed in conjunction with the President, a shared governance process. The faculty and the Academic Senate play a pivotal role in the Program Review process. A committee of the Academic Senate (Academic Senate Program Review [ASPR]) is responsible for approving of the Program Review reports. However, a major weakness of the Program Review process at Harbor College is that there is no administrative input into the development and approval of the Program Review. Thus, Administration is not a direct stakeholder in its implementation. Furthermore, there is some confusion regarding what a Program Review should include. One copy of the Program Review received by a member of the accreditation committee consisted of some 50 pages of data with no analysis. It seems there is confusion even among Harbor faculty and staff about Program Review. (IIA1)

A review of the College’s offerings suggests that they are congruent with Los Angeles Harbor College’s mission statement. The College offers transfer programs in over sixty areas; it offers an Honors Program; further it offers over twenty occupational and career certificated programs. Additionally, the College offers a wide range of general education programs. (IIA1a)

The College Curriculum Committee reviews the methods of instruction when a new course comes to the Committee for approval. However, there is no cumulative data regarding the effectiveness of types of various modes and types of instructions. While this is not an easy task, given the number of courses taught, it might be desirable for the College to review and compare data regarding such variables as courses retention and successful course completion as they relate to the modes of instruction, particularly in relations to traditional methods versus online instructions. The campus has recently instituted a Distributive/Distance Learning Committee (Art. 40 LACCD &AFT Agreement) that has begun the oversight process of establishing protocols for technology support issues, quality of instruction and faculty evaluation. All distance education courses are approved through the normal curriculum process. The College has a joint Title V grant with West Los Angeles College to develop online courses in Administration of Justice, Culinary Arts and television courses in a transfer degree. It was unclear how these specific subjects were chosen and how they reflect the mission and goals. (IIA1b)

A review of College files suggests that there has been some dialog regarding the importance of student learning outcomes. The College has provided at least four forums at which student learning outcomes have been discussed. The faculty has played a central role in discussions related to student learning outcomes. (IIA1c)

Issues related to student learning outcomes can be addressed at the College, program or course levels. The College’s focus thus far has been primarily at the course level, where there is an attempt to ensure congruency between SLO, course outlines of record and course syllabus. The College has made significant improvements in revising course outlines of record to ensure that they included student learning outcomes. But the process is not complete. (IIA1c)
Further, last summer, the College developed institutional SLOs. Although the College’s SLOs are quite comprehensive and adequate, there is no evidence of College-wide dialogue regarding this, outside of the Academic Planning Cluster. This is quite important because institutional commitment to SLOs would require College-wide dialogue and discussion. (IIA1c)

Currently the College is attempting to close the gap in the development of student learning outcomes by trying to develop SLOs for programs and certificates. This could become a very difficult task. Normally, SLOs are developed either upward (course level and up) or downward (College level and down). At Harbor, SLOs have been developed at the course level and the College level. The challenge is to ensure that SLO at the program level are congruent with both course level SLOs as well College level ones. (IIA1c)

At the College, Program Review is one vehicle for assuring quality of program and offerings. The Program Review process provides statistics and analysis, which can be implemented to improve the quality of instructional programs. (IIA2, IIA2a)

At Los Angeles Harbor College, the faculty plays a very significant role in the implementation of Program Review process. The Program Review is under the supervision of a division chair who is a faculty member and who is responsible for the program. The faculty is also involved in every aspect of Program Review, and the Academic Senate has the authority to approve the report. Therefore, the faculty is fully involved in the Program Review process. However, the administration plays no role in Program Review process. (IIA2, IIA2a)

The College relies often, correctly, on faculty expertise to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes. However, frequently these competencies are measured through standardized tests. No doubt, class size does have an impact on SLO achievement, but so do teaching methodologies and practices. It is important for the College to use assessment instruments to establish the accuracy of grading and course examinations. (IIA2b)

The Self Study definition of quality relies on the degrees offered (AA and A.S degrees), successful course completion, and the number of degrees and certificates offered. However, the Self Study does not provide any statistics in support of the implied assumptions that that the College’s indicators do in fact demonstrate high quality instruction. It seems that a more objective indicator for establishing quality would be the success rate of students transfers to four-year institutions along with a similar indicator for those who complete vocational programs. For example, one may use the passing rate of nursing students on their state exam as a verification of quality instruction. (IIA2c)

The College does offer a wide range of teaching methodologies which include: lecture, lab, closed circuit television, and online instruction. Online courses are hosted on at least four different platforms offsite: WebCT, Etudes, BlackBoard, and other service
providers. However, there is no evidence to suggest that these methodologies are based upon research related to their effectiveness vis-à-vis diverse needs and learning styles of students. Although there has been some presentation to faculty regarding learning styles and “How Brain Works,” there is no indication that the College has performed any assessment of the student learning outcomes in relations to differences in teaching methodologies. For example: is there a difference between face to face classes and closed circuit television classes in relations to student learning outcomes? How about online classes? The Self Study states that the attrition rates are much higher in online classes when compared with face-to-face classes. Dialog with online faculty (meeting on Wed 22, 2006) revealed an estimate of a 50% dropout rate for online instruction. There is no comprehensive assessment of student learning outcomes. Students are encouraged to take the distance education student survey from the state Chancellor’s office. (IIA2d)

The College has recently instituted a Distance Learning Committee, a subcommittee of Curriculum. This has also been instituted at the District level. The committee is responsible for developing guidelines for curriculum development, quality standards, instructional support, and evaluations of faculty. The Committee is planning on investigating the standardization of online course platforms locally as well as on a District level. The College has just received a Title V grant (5-year) for online and distance education development. This is a joint grant with Los Angeles Valley College. This is to expand the Administration of Justice, Culinary Arts and Transfer degree program in combination with West Los Angeles and Los Angeles Valley College. (IIA2d)

The College Program Review process, provides adequate information about programs offered by the College. Indicators included in the Program Review are retention and successful course completion. These are two important indicators; however, student retention relates only indirectly to student learning outcomes. Further, there is unevenness in the quality of Program Reviews. For example the Program Review for Behavioral Sciences is quite comprehensive, whereas the one for Social Science is less so. (IIA2e)

The last accreditation report completed in 2000 recommended that the College “develop and implement an integrated educational, technologies, facilities, and human resources planning process supported by campus-wide Program Review and institutional research outcomes.” The College has responded fully and comprehensively to this recommendation. (IIA2f)

All degree programs at the College require an appropriate number of units in at least one area of study, and therefore provide the student with ability to develop technical and professional competencies needed for employment, external licensure and certification. (IIA4, IIA5)

Standards require that the student receive clear and accurate information about courses, programs, and transfer policies; further, it is expected that there is a course syllabus for
every section of each class which is consistent with official course outlines. Since the curriculum committee has recently approved of many new course outlines of records, it is important that department chairs ensure compliance with this new standards. Further, it is important that divisions keep copies on file. (IIA6, IIA6a)

The College Catalog provides adequate information about transfer policy, including specific information about transfer to the University of California and the California State University System. Transferable courses are marked clearly in the Catalog. There are appropriate articulation agreements with universities primarily in Southern California and to some extent in Northern California. (IIA6, IIA6a)

The standards require that the College would make appropriate arrangements when a program is discontinued or significantly altered. Board Rule 6803 (Viability Review) provides appropriate guidelines for doing so. (IIA6b)

College catalog is published every two years. It is a comprehensive document that contains appropriate and adequate information about College programs and policies. This is the College’s standard publication for informing the public about academic programs, including degree and certificate programs. It also includes course descriptions and provides information about graduation requirements. The College’s schedule of classes, published every term, provides additional and supplementary information. Finally, the College maintains a website that contains electronic information about the College, its programs, and policies. However, this site does not seem complete or comprehensive. For example, the site would not load properly when one wants to look up information about PACE. (IIA6c)

The Academic Senate has an appropriate policy regarding honesty and consequences for dishonesty. (IIA7b)

Los Angeles Harbor Community College is a non-sectarian institution. (IIA7c)

LA Harbor College does not offer programs in foreign locations. (IIA8)

**Recommendations**

See Recommendations 1 and 3 in Standard I.
B. Student Support Services

General Observations

The recommendations for Standard Five in the previous team’s March 2000 report referenced the overarching recommendations from the previous Accreditation Standard Three. That recommendation was for the College to develop and implement an integrated educational, technology, facilities, and human resource planning process supported by campus-wide Program Review and institutional research outcomes. The last visiting team also recommended that the College file an interim report responding to two recommendations regarding participatory governance and a College master plan.

Findings and Evidence

Since that time, the College has developed a College-wide participatory planning process and Strategic Plan, a Program Review process, and publication of the FACT Book by the Research Office.

In Student Services, all departments have initiated Program Review, in addition to the Unit Plan, which has been an ongoing annual plan supporting expenditures of any funding that may become available. Student Services has developed its own Program Review process, separate from the other Clusters of the College, which is participatory and includes faculty, administration, staff, and students as part of its Cluster Sub-committee of the CPC. The Unit Plans are primarily written by the respective supervisor for the area and the Student Services managers meet bi-monthly with the Vice-President of Student Services. The quality of the Program Reviews varies with respect to the use of institutional outcomes as well as the degree to which student learning outcomes identify measurable outcomes. Student Services have satisfactorily completed the processes required by the College; however, tying the Unit Plan and Program Review processes to the College goals and institutional outcomes remains for future implementation.

The Self Study Report for Student Services is well written, comprehensive, and includes descriptive summary, self-evaluation, and planning agendas for all sections within Standard IIB. The College provides extensive and comprehensive student services programs for its students, prospective students and community. Student Services recognizes several of its programs and services as exemplary. The report identifies commitment to priorities for student access, progress, learning, and success, which is referenced and supported in the program and survey files.

All Student Services Programs have completed Unit Plans and initiated Program Reviews during the past year, and both documents include Student Learning Outcomes. Identified needs include staffing and improved facilities in several areas; however, data to support the rationale within the report is frequently not specified in terms of student outcomes. Budget is most often identified as a prerequisite for improvement. Student outcome data is prevalent in numerous documents but is typically not integrated into the dialogue. This
is also the case for evaluation of services and outcomes. The development and implementation of a participatory planning process has influenced the culture, supported Program Review, and begun the process for a student learning outcomes accountability model.

The continued decline in enrollment and funding has accentuated the concern and focus on budget issues, especially for faculty and staff positions, vacancies, and potential vacancies. (IIB)

The student support services are affirmatively committed to addressing the accreditation standards, and the report identifies comprehensive programs throughout the student support services, including outreach and recruitment. Evaluation of progress, learning, and success is conducted through unit plans, Program Reviews, surveys, and faculty and staff evaluations and are evident throughout the report. Specific support data by program area is less consistently identified in the dialogue; however, the results of two student satisfaction surveys (District, 2005; College, 2006) are generally positive.

The report identifies institutional student outcomes toward transfer, completion of programs, and achievement of student’s educational goals. The links by specific program with outcomes vary, but are generally supported in the Program Review, program files, and survey files, with various degrees of integration of data.

A review of services offered by the Student Support Services indicates that a wide range of services is offered by the College. The programs are evidenced in the unit plans, Program Reviews, and student surveys. The list is very comprehensive and comparable to other community Colleges, especially considering the current size of the College. (II2B1)

Although the ranges of services are comprehensive, according to the Self Study, some of these services are not very accessible to students (for example: page 122 refers to a three-month waiting period for the students to see a career counselor). The Student Services 2006 student survey responses indicate that student satisfaction with the hours and availability of services is generally high, but less so in the areas of financial aid, counseling, and orientation. According to the College’s Self Study, the ratio of counselors to students is 1 to 1948. While this may be above what might be desirable, it is not that different from other community Colleges. Student Services has also implemented or plans to implement a variety of computer supported services for students, e.g., CCCApply, imaging, informational DVD, expanded website information, etc.).

The Planning Agenda is extensive, and focuses primarily on requesting numerous staffing and other budgetary needs. Given the current budget and declining enrollments, focus may need to be given to alternative strategies.

The three-month delay for career counseling appointments needs to be addressed within the program as it is extreme in comparison with other waiting times for services within
counseling according to the self-study, interviews, and student survey responses, and is needed to address the needs of the large number of undecided students.

The College Catalog is comprehensive and written clearly. It provides students with what they need to know about the College and its programs and requirements. However, there is no statement about academic freedom. Student Services has also made information more readily to students through its collaborative efforts to develop its newly updated website and student services marketing materials, including development of a promotional and informational DVD, which were viewed during the visit. (IIB2)

**Conclusion**

Student Services appears to be addressing the learning support needs of its students in spite of the cited budgetary and staffing restrictions. Both of the Student Surveys (2005, 2006) results support this finding. (IIB3)

This standard requires the institution to provide equitable access to all of its students regardless of service locations. This standard is difficult to comply with since offering programs at off campus locations usually requires increased resources and new infrastructure. However, the College has recognized the need for leadership and advocacy in this area by hiring an associate dean for off campus programs. According to the College’s survey, students are satisfied with services they receive. (IIB3a)

The College’s student government program encourages personal growth and civic responsibility. Workshops dealing with self-advocacy skills and citizenship skills offered by the Life Skills Center are helpful and appropriate. The Political Science 41 course dealing with leadership is an excellent tool for exposing student to the importance of civic responsibility in a democratic society. Students openly discussed their satisfaction with the College’s support of their development, and responded positively in the student surveys. (IIB3b)

The Counseling Department is the primary unit on campus responsible for delivery of counseling services. The Department offers transfer, career, academic vocational, honors, personal, special needs and articulation counseling. The counselors seem adequately trained and possess the appropriate qualifications. Through interviews, the team determined that, as with many counseling departments, the staff feels demoralized because they feel they are understaffed. However, the planned building of a student services building made possible by Prop. A/AA Funds should help to energize the counseling faculty and staff. (IIB3c)

Specialized counseling services for various populations (EOPS, SPS) are also offered, as well as psychological services through the Health Center Program. The Life Skills Program has received exemplary rewards from the Board of Governors. There is a strong desire expressed to expand services to students. Further collaboration between the various departments providing these services may provide the means to do so.
The College offers a wide range of programs aimed at promoting student understanding and appreciation of diversity. These programs include: Women’s History Week, Black History Week and Pacific Islander’s Day. These programs are very important and should be continued. Students and staff express pride in the diversity of the College and there are plans to expand multiple languages and formats for service. The Student Equity Report is thorough and current and may assist departments in their Program Review. (IIB3d)

The Matriculation Coordinator works with the Assessment Center to evaluate the admission and placement instruments of the College to minimize bias. (IIB3e)

The College is aware and sensitive to the requirements pertaining to the confidentiality and security of student files. The records are housed in a secure environment. However, with the growing need for storage of student files, there is need for additional space. It seems that the College is already aware of this issue and is planning to scan documents using imaging equipment. The College should continue with this initiative. The age and risk of old files requires expansion of the student imaging system and staffing to accomplish this. (IIB3f)

This standard requires that the College evaluate student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs and further, the institutions ensures that student support services contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes.

The College uses various methods for obtaining information about the services it provides. Among them are the Unit Plans, Program Reviews and student surveys (2006, LAHC; 2005, District Student Services Survey). The Unit Plans and the new Program Review process include Student Learning Outcomes; however, the preliminary Program Reviews do not include evaluation or criteria for evaluation.

An “internal” process of Program Review was implemented in 2004-05 and supplements the annual unit plans. External review processes have existed for some time in several programs (Financial Aid Office, EOPS, SPS, CDC, and Matriculation). With the initiation of Program Review, Student Services has a mechanism for self-evaluation and ongoing improvement of its programs.

Student Services programs have made real progress in implementing Student Learning Outcomes into both their planning and Program Review processes. Attention needs to be given to coordinating the student learning outcomes between the two processes, and using data to validate measurable outcomes. This second step will complete the evaluation loop and permit the departments to engage in additional dialog for improvement of services to student learning. (11B4)

**Recommendations**

None.
C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

Library and learning resources play a significant role in the delivery of instruction and overall student learning outcomes.

Findings and Evidence

A review of library and learning support services at the College indicates that given the mission and budgetary conditions of the College, there is appropriate quantity of books and other learning resources. Further, library materials seem of high quality and related to the teaching mission of the College. There is enough depth and diversity in library holdings. Library hours seem adequate for and appropriate for the College. Library has representation at the curriculum committee; and thus, there is a systematic channel for faculty input.

Other Learning Support Services

The Learning Assistance Center is housed in the same building as the Library but is a separate operating unit and is mentioned on page 92 of the 2006 Self Study. The programs are well used and provides excellent services to the students they serve. (Interview with director.)

General Observations

The Library Services support student learning through selection of and access to research materials -books, periodicals and databases. Selection of material is based on curriculum and solicited input from faculty. These resources are available from any campus computer and off campus through the Internet. The Library maintains a large highly circulated collection of textbooks in Reserve (statistics from Library annual report).

Findings and Evidence

The staff provides information literacy instruction to students via one-on one instruction, library class orientations and for credit courses. They have also linked library classes with the English department. There are in-class evaluations done for each of these sessions, and student learning outcomes are identified in the course outlines. The library faculty serves on several committees including curriculum. All courses must have library
approval to insure adequate resources to support the curriculum. The library is to be commended for converting one of its courses to an online format. The selection of resources is a local decision. There is some purchasing through the CCCL consortium.

The Library Services is included in the general student survey and reports a high level of satisfaction. The Library has conducted several of their own online user surveys. Hours and the size of the collection seem appropriate for the needs of the students as is reflected in surveys. The staff and atmosphere in the library was one of openness and approachability.

**Conclusions**

Although the majority of students indicated satisfaction with the library collection, in the 2005 Student Survey (p.13 Table 20), 17 percent of students responded that currency of the library collection does not apply to them. The library needs to consider the implication of this statistic. Another area of unmeasured need is diversity. There is no indication if bilingual students are among those who do not use the library. The Library may want to consider ways to outreach to more students. Although the library has developed a program review document, student learning outcomes and assessment needed to be more fully integrated. The above examples would be some to consider for program SLOs.

The Library continues to request an additional librarian to expand its services to meet national standards. The effort to look at consolidation of purchasing of materials and online resources for library resources needs to continue to maximize purchasing power. There is no intra-access for all District students for all online databases within the District regardless of campus location.

**Recommendations**

None.
Standard III

Resources

General Observations

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

A. Human Resources

General Observations

The College has made tremendous progress in responding to the previous team's recommendations in prioritizing staffing needs, decentralizing human resources, following personnel procedures to evaluate all faculty, and providing more opportunities for professional development. Moreover, development in the human resources area has taken place in the context of the new participatory governance structure and comprehensive master plan process, which result in a higher level of engagement, but still needs work in the areas of effectively satisfying staffing needs, supporting participation in professional development (especially in assessing student learning outcomes), and constructively evaluating all personnel.

Findings and Evidence

The College meets the personnel qualification and selection criteria specified by Standard IIIA, and has responded to the previous team’s recommendation regarding prioritizing staffing needs. The hiring process includes both District directives and College negotiated processes. On one hand, the District delineates minimum qualification standards for the selection of faculty, certificated administrators, and classified staff and administrators. Job descriptions reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. The District also sets the protocol for advertising available positions, identifying eligible candidates, and conducting interviews for faculty. On the other hand, at the College level, the hiring of tenure track faculty adheres to a process “authorized in the Constitution of the Academic Senate and detailed in the Faculty Hiring Manual agreed upon by administration and the Academic Senate” (p.151). It includes needs identification in unit plans, prioritization by the Academic Senate Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee, approval by the Senate, and action by the College president. Hiring of adjunct faculty follows directives in the faculty collective bargaining agreement. Identification of classified hiring needs go through the
Staffing Committee (for replacement positions) or cluster operational plans (for new positions) and the College Planning Council.

While the employees are well qualified and the diverse student body express their satisfaction with instruction and services, interviews and the Report point to several problems. Most important is inadequate staffing reported in many areas on campus. There are reported staffing shortages in Student Services (p. 142), the Library (p. 148), the Health Center (p. 125), the custodial department, Admissions and Records, and IT microcomputer systems administration (p. 156). Also, the previous team’s recommendation to “accelerate the decentralization of human resources to the College to facilitate the hiring of all staff in a timely manner” still needs work in some respects. Union representatives of classified staff see the need for better representation of their interests in the Staffing Committee and for supervisory openness to regular input. The District Personnel Commission hires all classified staff and gives examinations. However, it functions as a separate entity, and its process of giving exams and having the College hire from its established list generally retards the response to hiring needs. Last but not least, inadequate College financial resources seriously limit the provision of human resources and dishearten members who followed the lengthy process of prioritizing needs only to see all requests turned down. Administrators, faculty, staff and students all voice the need for “money” to hire. (IIIA2, IIIA2a)

The Report and cited documents show evidence that the College satisfies the basic requirements for systematically evaluating all personnel; for subscribing to a code of professional ethics; for developing, publicizing and administering personnel policies and processes, as well as ensuring fairness; for providing security and confidentiality for personnel records; and for adequately addressing diversity and equity issues with the assistance of the Compliance officer on campus. However, because of the recent identification of SLOs, assessing effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes is not part of related personnel evaluation. Also, the previous team’s recommendation is for the College to “consistently follow written personnel procedures to evaluate all faculty and staff in a timely manner.” While the District has oversight of monitoring evaluations, and division chairs ensure on-schedule administration of faculty evaluations, classified staff is evaluated less regularly, even less so administrators. (IIIA1b, IIIA1d, IIIA3a, IIIA3b, IIIA4, IIIA1c)

As stated in this Standard, the College and District support professional development that is consistent with its mission and meets personnel needs. Such support for faculty, staff and administrators includes tuition supplements, conference attendance funds, release time, and FLEX activities. The District sponsors some workshops, while the College Flex coordinator and Staff Development Committee chair (presently vacant) oversee the assessment of staff needs and activity outcomes to ensure effective implementation of activities. Focus of faculty training includes student learning outcomes development and participation in the Program Review process, which provides opportunities for dialogue among colleagues and administrators. While these activities respond to the previous team’s recommendation to provide more opportunities for all staff for continued
professional development, ways to release classified staff for participation need to be explored. (IIIA5)

Conclusions

While the College satisfies basic criteria set forth in Standard III, it needs to pay attention to the serious shortage of faculty and staff, as perceived by the Accreditation Team. Since faculty provide direct contact with students and staff does so directly or indirectly in support of administration and faculty, shortages impact employee morale and service to students. Moreover, the new inclusive Program Review/planning and participatory governance processes make more demands on employee’s time and energy. Although these processes increase the degree of fairness and openness in matters important to employees, they need to see that the results are worth their efforts. Moreover, with the mandated implementation of SLOs and their assessment to inform teaching and program development, faculty need more support before they are evaluated for their effectiveness in this area. As a result, improving funding and exploring innovative ways to solve staffing needs, evaluating and streamlining participatory processes to save time and increase practicality, and providing training in assessing SLOs and using results to inform practice are critical for supporting faculty and staff to put forth their best in serving students and to excel in an evaluation of their effectiveness. (IIIA2, IIIA6, IIIA5, IIIA1c)

B. Physical Resources

General Observations

The last accreditation report required that the College develop and coordinate educational and facilities master plans and then develop budget plans from these master plans. The interim report acknowledged that facilities projects are developed from the educational master plan. While the completion of projects in the capital outlay and Bond programs will probably result in meeting the needs identified in the educational master plan, a formal written facilities master plan does not appear to exist. Having a written priority list would be beneficial in ensuring that implementation is in alignment with the educational master plan and that some of the earlier construction projects contribute to the College’s need to generate FTES. (IIIB 2b)

Findings and Evidence

The passage of Prop A/AA has clearly reinvigorated the College in ways that should carry over to other areas of the College that might be in need of new energy. The fact that this “windfall” occurred parallel with the institution of new accreditation standards suggests that improvement in many areas could be encouraged by and linked to the renovation and addition of facilities. Key to all of this is the participation by all constituencies from the College and its greater communities.
The District hired a project management firm to oversee the entire District Bond project and assigned project managers to different areas. The project was initiated by the development of a master program plan by an architectural firm. Harbor College requested the services of one company to develop the entire program rather than awarding one contract per construction project. This contributed to their ability to proceed and implement their initial projects. They also contracted Pinnacle to provide construction management services. (One of the first construction contracts was awarded to a firm that has proven to be unsatisfactory. This has resulted in a delay to the overall plan.) (IIIB 1a)

At the time of this visit, there is considerable work being accomplished on campus. The College has weekly meetings with representatives of major constituent groups to review the Bond projects. The meetings are led by Pinnacle and review all manner of issues – both large and small. Construction areas are fenced off to protect the campus community causing frequent detours as people move about the campus. (IIIB 2)

The College believes that it does a good job maintaining its facilities even though funding for short and long-term maintenance has been reduced. The campus community appears to take pride in the appearance and condition of the campus, and members of the campus community are engaged in reporting needs in this area in a thoughtful and timely manner. This does not diminish the fact that there has been a reduction in the maintenance and operations work force and that the morale of existing employees is a concern.

There is regular and systematic evaluation of space and condition of space. The facilities/campus plan appears to be thoughtfully created and student centered, and accommodation for an improved and increasing technological presence is planned. Balancing responsiveness to the ongoing, day-to-day care and maintenance of existing campus facilities with the increasingly complex management and implementation of new and renovated facilities is a challenge. (IIIB 1a)

The College is being both sensitive and compliant in matters of health and safety as the renovation and building activities progress. Likewise, the campus has been attentive to providing comfortable access to all who come to the campus – both in existing facilities and newly planned spaces. Off-campus facilities are also monitored for access, health, and safety. While the College does not have a committee that directly monitors these matters, the College appears to have prioritized access, health, and safety issues.

The College believes that an effective operational plan will help to prioritize health and safety issues/concerns and that there are security issues that must be resolved. (The self-study description of campus security operations causes one to suspect that the hybrid Campus Police/LA Sheriff model may not be as efficient as desired and a good deal more costly, even though there appears to be sufficient campus protection during hours of instruction.) (IIIB 1b)

Participative planning took place to determine which existing buildings would require major renovation. While cosmetic and, sometimes, structural repairs were listed as important, health and safety concerns seemed to influence many of the decisions, as did the need to accommodate
better and newer technological capabilities. (In this regard, the Child Care facility – essential to supporting the entire campus community – is of special concern.) While it is clear that the campus community was/is active in creating all facilities plans, it is not as clear that these plans are directly tied to data-influenced plans for future growth – in programs and/or activities. (IIIB 1a)

Frustration over unexpected obstacles/delays in the renovation/building process is expressed in the self-study and validated through group and individual interviews/conversations. The self-study planning agenda calls on everyone to do everything in their power to keep the projects on track. This is occurring and, as it appears more and more likely that some construction will not occur due to unexpected escalation of construction costs, the various user groups are being thoughtful and responsible in making hard decisions in this regard. In light of this, projects are regularly evaluated and go through a value engineering process ensuring that dollars are effectively spent. (IIIB2a)

Conclusion

The College needs to develop a Facilities Master Plan. (IIIB 1a)

The College should ensure that the implementation of State construction projects and Bond projects are prioritized related to the Educational Master Plan. This should include focusing on those projects that will contribute to FTES generation that in turn will help to generate revenue. (IIIB 1a)

C. Technology

General Observations

Technology support is designed to meet the needs of the College with an emphasis on operational systems and College-wide communications and to a lesser degree, teaching, learning and research. The College technology staff provides installation and maintenance service for computers, printers, copiers, software, Exchange, network accounts, network storage/backup, local applications, campus networks, telephones and some AV equipment. Academic departments are responsible for planning for their own computer lab and classroom technology needs. Online courses are hosted by a number of external service providers. The District office is responsible for providing College access to the Internet and District information systems (e.g., SAP) and for providing electronic research data to the College. The District does not allow the College technology staff to access the District-supported Internet router and firewall for testing or troubleshooting. This has caused problems when the technology has failed and the entire College was without Internet access and the District support staff did not respond in a timely manner (IIIC1, IIIC1a).
Findings and Evidence

The College takes a largely decentralized approach to technology planning and the identification of needs. It is largely done on a departmental basis through Program Review and to the extent that funds are available. There is an information technology unit plan. There is not a technology master plan for the College. There is not a College-wide technology committee to make recommendations for College-wide needs. There is an Instructional Technology Advisory Committee that meets on occasion to serve as a “sounding board” for technology proposals. (IIIC2, IIIC1d)

The College systematically budgets for standardized software license renewals for academic and administrative computing (e.g., Microsoft Office, Symantec Antivirus), and commits to funding online course license renewals. The College does not systematically plan for hardware upgrades/replacements due to the decentralized nature of technology planning and limited funding. Technology planning for new building construction includes infrastructure standards for network, power and phones, and includes three levels of classroom technology options that are selected by faculty within budget limitations. (III1c)

The College provides information technology training to faculty and staff through flex activities twice a year. The District provides onsite training for District applications. Faculty and staff can receive flex credit or limited tuition reimbursement for off-time classes. There is an informal faculty network of supporting each other in learning new applications. Technology grants include major staff development resources that are well used. (IIIC1b)

Conclusions

The College addresses most of its technology needs in a decentralized manner. There is not a College-wide technology plan to address the vision, principles, strategies, implementation or evaluation. The College does a commendable job of providing technology resources, support and training with limited resources. The College could benefit from developing a technology master plan that addresses all technology needs---academic and administrative. This could bring coherence and direction for the unit plans and provide institutional assurance that it is providing services and support for all areas in a systematic fashion. The College could also benefit from establishing technology committee to make recommendations for technology planning and resource allocation.

Develop and implement a College-wide technology master plan that integrates with the College planning process and reflects the strategic, long-term, technology vision and goals of the institution. (IIIC 2)
D. Financial Resources

General Observations

The College appears to have marginally responded to the previous team’s recommendation to develop budget plans from educational and facilities master plans.

Based on the recommendation contained in the previous report, the College planning process has helped to identify prioritized goals for budget and funding issues and to ensure that operational plans are linked to financial plans and that all is linked to institutional plans for content and timeliness. The development of the Budget Committee and the CPC creates a process which participants are to take master plans into consideration when approving budget allocations.

Findings and Evidence

Unfortunately, the College has had several years of budget deficits and has had to significantly reduce expenditures not only to meet their annual allocation but also to repay the District for the previous years’ shortfalls. This has only led to a downward spiral and a failure to regularly meet FTES goals thus receiving less funding in subsequent years. The College requested and received forgiveness for $6.4 M. of debt. In return, the College was required to successfully provide an in-depth analysis of ways to reduce expenditure and increase revenues. In doing so, it appears that the College maintained those programs and services that are required and/or contribute significantly to FTES production. (IIID1, IIID1b, IIID1c)

The District recognizes that there are some unique circumstances that exist at LAHCC; however they need to be consistent in the way they deal with all nine Colleges.

The College would like to find better and more satisfying ways to involve employees in addressing financial matters in terms of the College mission. The planning processes appear to have created a systematic and thoughtful approach to requesting, receiving, and utilizing funds and the College has explored opportunities for external funding. Title V funds, for instance, seem to have stimulated and encouraged curricular innovations that have benefited, to a great extent, students entering the workforce. There is lots of grant writing activity at the College, but the planning agenda suggests that the grant application process be better linked to unit plans that are prioritized through the larger College planning process. (IIID1d, IIID 2e)

Financial information appears to be accessible and available to those who may require it and dialog around financial matters appears to be occurring and seems to be valuable. The College elicits greater classified and student participation in the budget/financial planning process. While the College would benefit from a new allocation model, it seems to be satisfied that the District provides adequate information for effective College planning. The College president has invited campus participation in learning about and discussing fiscal matters; greater availability of this
information through clear and simple posting on the College website would be helpful and allow greater participation. (IIID2b, IIID 1d, IIID 2b)

The current allocation model holds Colleges responsible for deficits and this College appears to be working hard to balance its budget. While the College has limited resources for unexpected expenses, it appears that the District works with LAH in meeting its emergency needs. (IIID 2c)

External funding is managed and audited to ensure that funds are used responsibly and well. The College Foundation is a valuable resource and the planning agenda suggests that major gifts campaigns and Foundation fund-raising efforts need to be coordinated and targets aligned in order to better meet immediate and otherwise unfunded College needs. (IIID 2e)

It is clear that the College wants to be responsible in its fiscal planning and management but the bleak financial picture of the District and the State causes frustration. The completion of the operational plans and procedures manuals should enable the College to perform more thoughtful and precise analysis and evaluation for the future. (IIID 2e)

Conclusions

Based on interviews, the Controllers’ staff and the LAHCC Senior Budget Analyst were very knowledgeable not only of the accounting processes but the history and circumstances that make up the various accounts.

The District is financially well-managed and serves as an umbrella for the nine Colleges. The Colleges have that resource to fallback on although, at times, it may appear to be a hindrance. The College and District are trying to reconcile their differences recognizing that they need one another’s support.

Many at the College community believe that their inability to adequately provide programs and services is a result of their inadequate budget allocation and that this is caused by the District’s unwillingness to provide additional funding. This perspective was evident in areas of the self-study, interviews, and the open forums. During an interview, the Chancellor acknowledged the need to review the District budget allocation model and proposed the use of an outside consultant.

It was also observed from reading manuals and minutes, as well as from interviews, that the LAHCC budget process involves a representative from a number of constituencies. In fact, in some cases, like the College Budget Committee, the faculty is not only involved but chairs the committees.

The College is doing its best to promote and maintain the highest quality possible in its allocation and utilization of resources. The College is grappling with the institution and implementation of a number of processes and plans – many are in their infancy; thus, they are incomplete and have not been used fully. Likewise, many of them have not been tested and their
effect on institutional planning and improvement cannot be fully measured. Some obstacles appear to be external and, despite identified obstacles, the College has persevered and done a great number of exceptional things. It has been as responsive as possible to the recommendations of the previous report and realizes that there is still work to be done.

While the College has made a good effort to address the recommendations of the previous report (as documented in the response to the mid-term report) and appears to be fully aware of work yet to be done, it is unclear why delays in completing requests fully have occurred. It could simply be that there are not enough people and not enough time or it could be that District restraints have slowed the processes down. Lack of clarity on “where to go from here” or the lack of understanding that the crucial aspects of the College’s structure/processes under review should have long lasting and ongoing value could be key to full completion.

LAHC should make every effort to urge a re-examination of the District allocation model so that the College can hire and maintain staff sufficient to supporting the College’s mission and vision for the future and adequately fund its program and operation. This is essential to growth and improvement. (IIID1b)

LAHC should continue to monitor and implement carefully the facilities projects funded by Prop A/AA in ways that support and encourage growth and student success – purposely and cautiously. Engage the community (on and off campus) in dialog that demonstrates that this is their community College. Ensure that programs meet current and future needs in a way that will encourage growth to match facility. (IIID1a)

The District should proceed with plans to have a third party review the current budget allocation model. If this does not appear imminent, the District should look at alternatives such taking all fixed costs off the top and having a small College allotment. (IIID1b)

The College needs more involvement of administration in the budget process. They are ultimately the ones accountable for all College revenues and expenditures - working closely with faculty, classified and students. This accountability requires that administrators identify all resources that would contribute to the educational master plan. (IIID1d)

**Recommendations**

See Recommendation 5 in Standard IV.
Standard IV
Leadership & Governance

A. Decision Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

This standard expects the institution to recognize and utilize leadership throughout the institution. Shared governance must exist to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services.

LAHC has served its community well since 1949. It continues to be a viable institution with a close-knit staff focused on serving students. Appreciation for the College is evident in the students. The College reached a high enrollment of 12,500 students in for about 1990. Current enrollment has stabilized at 8,500. Its growth plan hopes to achieve 12,000 students by 2010.

The College is having obvious problems with its funding level and its planning processes. Both these issues are fully developed below. However, despite these issues it remains a College whose overall interest and focus is on the student.

Findings and Evidence

Minutes, memos, and interviews showed that in response to the 2000 Visiting Team Recommendation the College has instituted a governance process that is inclusive. Opportunities for involvement are numerous and outlined in several College documents including the College Planning and Procedures Manual, the College Governance Document, and the Budget Policies and Procedures Manual. But while the self study does a good job in describing the hard won participatory governance structure/process culminating in the Los Angeles Harbor College Participatory Governance Agreement, at the same time it raises concern that only 26% of the respondents felt that their participation in the process “results in a favorable outcome for LAHC.” (IVA1)

The role of the College Planning Council (PAC) is clear and the College has written policies that provide for faculty, staff, student, and administrative participation in the process. The policy specifies the process in sufficient detail so that individuals can understand how to bring ideas forward from ideas from their constituency to appropriate policy, planning, and special purpose bodies. The institutional administrative staff has a clear role in the governance process as does faculty, staff, and students. (IVA1, IVA2, IVA2a)

Minutes show that the PAC meets regularly and deals with key College issues such as Strategic Planning, Educational Planning and budget. A number of committees report to
the Pac including the budget committee, which ties the PAC to the budget development process. It is important that as budget reductions occur, either voluntarily or through the District Allocation Grant Committee, the PAC remain a venue for determining action plans and other responses to the financial crisis. (IVA1, IVA2, IVA2a)

Policy manuals, minutes, and interviews show clearly established governance structures, processes, and practices. The interests of the administrators, faculty, and staff are clearly in the best interests of the institution. However, there is some concern with this Standard. The College has a structure and process which survey results indicate is not working as well as it should as evidenced by 38% participating in the process and “even lower mark as to whether governance decisions are ‘fair’ and ‘open.’” The self-evaluation dismisses these respondents by declaring, “misimpressions about the process are fed by nonparticipation in it,” and additionally in the planning agenda to “share even clearer information about the governance process for fuller participation in by all members of the College community, particularly classified staff.” It does not appear that this concern is only about participation; it’s also about empowerment and feeling that the time spent in the process is well spent. In interviews, it was evident that the governance process is regularly used to make important decisions about planning, budget, facilities, and numerous other issues. However, it remains a challenge to convince faculty and staff to engage with and believe in the process. So while progress has been made, the expectation of an open process providing opportunities for reflective dialog still has a way to go. (IVA3, IVA3)

All meetings of the governance system are managed through consensus, which is defined as reaching an agreement without necessarily unanimity on every point. At the time of the previous visit, the CPC (then called the PAC) was a forum in which decision-making was difficult if not impossible due to the need for all to agree on each decision. Minutes and interviews showed that the implementation of a new committee with new responsibilities, members and rules of order resulted in a venue for discussion about wide ranging topics which produces results. (IVA1, IVA2, IVA3)

The College relies on the Academic Senate and curriculum Committee for recommendations about student learning programs and services. The College has a strong tradition of “exclusivity” for the faculty senate that hinders shared decision-making. This was most evident in the Program Review process. (IVA2b)

Evidence was not in place that demonstrated that a regular and systematic evaluation of the governance systems effectiveness was in place. It is recommended that the President and Senate, in consultation, periodically review the effectiveness of the Governance process and publish their results. (IVA5)

Review of materials showed that the College advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in all its relationships. It agrees to comply with Commission standards and policies. The College also agrees to expeditiously respond to recommendations made by the Commission. (IVA4)
B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

LA Harbor College is part of the multi-camps Los Angeles Community College District. This District, and therefore the College, has a seven member Board of Trustees, functioning as an independent, policy-making body, which is ultimately responsible for all legal matters and for establishing policies that assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the College programs and services. Minutes, policy, and process forms show that the Board is also responsible for the financial stability of the College and for selecting and evaluating the District Chancellor. (IVB1)

Findings and Evidence

The Board appears to be unusually unified in its actions that are properly focused on the public interest. It appears to be a strong advocate for the system. (IVB1a)

The Board is focused on the mission of the District and its Colleges. However, it has not indicated its desire to see key accrediting themes such as Student Learning Outcomes, or Educational Dialog. It is noted that the District Educational Philosophy was most recently amended 12-17-86. The Mission was adopted 01-14-87. Neither incorporates the 2004 Standards language for Student Learning Outcomes. Consequently the District’s statement is focused more on what the District does as opposed to what the students learn. A re-writing of these statements is recommended. (IVB1b)

A review of policy and minutes shows that Board accepts ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. While comments were made about new Board member orientation, no organized process was evident. Therefore, one area for improvement would include the establishment of a Board orientation for new trustees and clear and regular process for Board self-evaluation. The Board has a code of ethics, but the code does not define how behavior that violates the code will be dealt with. The Board accepts responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity for the District. The Board has published bylaws, policy and administrative rules specifying Board size, duties, responsibilities, and structure and operating procedures. A review of Board minutes shows that the Board consistently acts in a manner consistent with its rules. There was not clear evidence that the Board regularly evaluates its operational policies and processes. (IVB1c, IVB1d, IVB1e)

The BOT rules provide for continuity of Board membership and staggered terms of office. The team did not find a formalized program for Board development and new member orientation. Therefore, one area for improvement would include the establishment of a Board orientation for new trustees. The Board has a clear and regular process for Board self-evaluation. The Board of Trustees have posted Board Rules to the District website.
The BOT also has a rule (1308) for the selection of the College President. It is also noted that the Board has a Code of Ethics and it was observed that this Code was regularly followed. (IVB1f, IVB1g, IVB1i)

The Board has responsibility for selecting and evaluating the District chancellor. Appropriate authority is delegated for the operation of the District. There is a clear process for evaluation of the presidents of the Colleges. (IVB1j)

Standard IVB.2. calls for the president to have primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads with authority to fulfill that responsibility. The self-study describes a president who is well liked and whose efforts are appreciated. The president is credited with moving the institution from talking about planning and evaluation to implementing. Interviews both at the District and campus level indicate high level of autonomy for the president. Examples of actions taken by the president are numerous. The self-study praises the president’s performance within the budget allocated to the College. (IVB2)

It is difficult to say whether or not the President staffs the College appropriately for the College’s complexity. This factor seems to be more an outcome of the District budget allocation process than the conduct of the President. It is the team’s view that the College needs to address more carefully its administrative structure and some College service areas as avenues for expense reduction. However, it is the team’s view that these reductions will not be sufficient to meet the expected deficits in the coming years, and furthermore, the cuts and delays in filling staff, counseling, and faculty positions has already effected the Colleges ability to fulfill its mission. The District allocation model needs review with an eye to addressing the special needs of the smaller Colleges. The team’s impression is that the President is managing effectively given the resources provided (IVB2a, IVB2d, IVB3c, VB3d)

The College Strategic Planning process establishes goals to improve effectiveness; however, they are not stated in measurable terms. The development of the strategic plan involves a planning cycle that provides multiple opportunities for informed input. With unit planning, cluster committees, and the College Planning Council it would appear there is adequate opportunity for input. The team notes that 90% of those polled say they were involved in College planning but 28% were not happy with the process. (IVB2b)

But there are concerns about the College’s planning process. The team questions the president’s ability to have a meaningful role in the improvement of the teaching and learning environment. (IVB2b, IVB2d)

There is a need for an evaluation process that looks at the overall planning and implementation efforts within the College. The College’s planning process does not appear to provide an assessment and data analysis that leads to increased institutional effectiveness. It does not include an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Neither
institutional or program evaluation appear to be based on a deep analysis of data. Given the budget stress the College is under, it would seem that creating planning and assessment processes that lead to increased effectiveness is essential. (IVB2b, IVB2d)

A review of the Program Review process, through a reading of procedures and interviews, raised a team concern about the Faculty Senate role in Program Review and/or program discontinuance. Since the program planning process begins with the program staff and then is forwarded to the Faculty Senate for final approval (i.e. no administrative action being taken or expected), then the only way programs are compelled to change or are eliminated is if they themselves propose it. This does not seem a likely circumstance, and therefore, calls the entire Program Review process into question. Obviously broad input into program decisions and presidential participation is discouraged by this process. (IVB2b, IVB2d)

The President does:

• Assure implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing Board policies
• Communicate effectively with communities served by the institution
• Set an collegial process for setting of values, goals, and priorities
• Delegate appropriately. (IVB2a, IVB2c, IVB2e)

Initially the team is uncertain if the overall responsibility for the health of LA Harbor College is clearly delineated between the District and the College. The absence in the self-study of a “responsibilities matrix” or “functional map” added to the team’s confusion. While a similar matrix, the “District Office, District wide, and College Responsibilities in Relation to Accreditation Standards,” was provided later, it is unclear whether or not this matrix was crafted through discussion between the College and District; nor is it clear how often this matrix is reviewed and the relationship evaluated and adjusted. Further, there are repeated examples of unilateral District decisions being imposed on the College that severely impact its resources. (IVB3, IVB3a)

The impact of the District process for budget adjustments, i.e. the District Allocation Grant Taskforce Review Process, on the planning and decision making of the College is substantial. While the Board and Districts responsibility for the overall budget is not in dispute, the current process may need to leave more room for the College planning process and president to influence the final outcomes and recommendations. The self-study states, “Under its guidance, District allocation procedures and policies have been revised to more accurately reflect the needs of each College’s educational programs.” The team did not find evidence to support this statement in the case of LAHC. The College reports that their financial difficulties began in 1991 with a revision of the funding process, and despite actions by the College and oversight by the District Allocation Grant Committee, the College remains in deficit. The adjustments to the fiscal crisis have been deep enough to impact student learning. A final concern is that the cuts so far undertaken do not seem to have emerged from the College’s planning process but instead were negotiated and are an outcome of a separate process using the District
Allocation Grant Committee. Therefore, as already mentioned, the District allocation model needs review with an eye to addressing the special needs of the smaller Colleges. (IVB2a, IVB2d, IVB3b, IVB3c, IVB3d)

There are several service questions regarding District support of the College. Interviews suggested that external contracts, such as with the sheriff’s department, have significant impact on the institutional budget without institutional input or provision of additional funds. Also, there appears to be concern about the responsibility for IT between the College and District. Standard IVB3b evaluation notes that services are effective but perceived by many to be “slow, bureaucratic and entrenched.” Note is made of the Chancellor’s study of District wide services. Standards require that, “the District/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the District/system from those of the Colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.” The self-study describes the composition of the District, the recent (beginning 1999) move to partial administrative decentralization, and the District’s participation in the commission’s Multi-College Pilot Program (MCPP). The self-study does not evaluate whether or not the road map works for the College, nor does it evaluate if it is adhered to.

The impression is left that while there is a move towards decentralization of services, it is not visible at the College level. (IVB3b)

The chancellor gives appropriate responsibility and authority to the president and holds her accountable for the College operations. The District functions as an effective liaison between the College and the Board. (IVB3e, IVB3f)

The District/system does not appear to regularly and systematically evaluate their integrity and effectiveness in meeting the College’s goals. Absent any evaluation there is, of course, no distribution of the results. (IVB3g)

**Conclusions**

Leadership at LAHC is excellent and respected. This leadership not only emerges from the administrative staff but was evident among the faculty and classified staff as well. The president is respected and a working governance system provides opportunity for all constituencies to participate in the decision-making process.

The governing Board is made up of dedicated trustees who effectively perform their role. There are differing views about the effectiveness of the District and College relations that need to be worked on.

Although much still needs to be done, the College has made great strides since the last accreditation with its planning process and is commended for that. It has a functioning governance system that has proved effective because of the respect between the participants.
There is a general concern about Student Learning outcomes. While efforts have been made and they are appearing in course outlines, the discussion with the campus left the team feeling that the campus has not embraced the principle of using SLOs. As the College continues its work on its planning process it is highly recommended that SLOs form the cornerstone on which it rests.

It is equally important that a dialogue about student learning be constructed in the College. The team noted that there is great amount of time spent on the construction program each week, and necessarily so, but it would seem that a dialogue about learning might deserve similar attention especially as a SLO based planning process is developed.

LA Harbor College meets Standard IV but has recommendations on a small number of issues of some urgency which, if not addressed immediately, may threaten the institution’s continued ability to meet accreditation standards. These center on the planning process.

**Recommendations**

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

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)
ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCREDITATION CERTIFICATION
OF CONTINUED COMPLIANCE

1. AUTHORITY

Los Angeles Harbor College is a public two-year community college operating under the
authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community
Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District.
This authority has existed continuously since 1949 with accreditation status regularly
renewed.

2. MISSION

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Harbor College's Board of Trustees
publicly affirms the College's educational Mission Statement which is reviewed and
updated by the College community on a regular basis. The Mission Statement is included
in the College Strategic Plan and in the official College catalog, and is also posted on the
College website. The Mission Statement was altered in 2002 to reflect the focus on the
global marketplace, and in 2004 to emphasize the institution's commitment to student
learning.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

Authority to make policy and exercise oversight for all operations is vested in an eight
member Board of Trustees for the Los Angeles Community College District, which
ensures that the District's mission of constituent College's are being implemented. The
Board also ensures the quality, integrity and financial stability of the Los Angeles
Community Colleges.

Board members are elected at large for terms of four years. Elections are held every two
years, with three members being chosen at one election and four members at the other.
The president and vice president of the Board of Trustees are elected by the Board for
one-year terms at the annual organizational and regular meeting. A student member is
elected annually -- the term is June 1 through May 31 of each year.

The Board generally meets twice a month on Wednesdays with the closed session
commencing at 12:30 p.m. and the public session commencing at 3:30 p.m. However,
special meetings of the Board are sometimes called to handle business that cannot be
dealt with completely at a regular meeting. For more information regarding the schedule
of Board meetings and locations, call the Office of the Board of Trustees at (213) 891-2044.
4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The current president has been the College's Chief Executive Officer since her appointment by the Board of Trustees in May of 2000. She is a full-time administrator and does not serve on the governing board of the District.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

The visiting team determined that the College has 11 administrative officers including College President, Vice Presidents, Deans and Associate Deans. These administrators were hired through an open, competitive employment process, and they were hired on the basis of their training and experience.

6. OPERATIONAL STATUS

Los Angeles Harbor College is fully operational with students actively enrolled in degree and certificate programs.

7. DEGREES

Los Angeles Harbor College offers associate degrees in 31 majors as well as a Liberal Arts Transfer Associate degree tailored to the requirements of a specific student and a specific transfer program. In addition, the College also offers Occupational Career Certificates in 21 areas, and 15 Skill Certificates in areas of community need.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The visiting team found that the degree programs offered by the College are consistent with the College's mission and purpose. The courses and programs were organized and delivered at an appropriate level consistent with Eligibility Requirements.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

The team examined course outlines which documented that the institution awards credits based on generally accepted practices in colleges and universities. The College catalog provides appropriate information about the awarding of academic credit.

10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT

Course outlines examined by the team verified that learning objectives are established for each course. The College is well along in the process leading to the establishment of student learning outcomes for courses, programs and the institution.
11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The visiting team has determined that Los Angeles Harbor has developed a curriculum of General Education requirements for students in all degree programs. These general education requirements ensure a breadth of knowledge consistent with that of the California University and State University systems. All degree programs require a minimum of 18 semester units of General Education for graduation or certificate completion. Graduates must also demonstrate competence in mathematics as well as reading and written expression. Student learning outcomes have been identified at the course levels and are currently being developed at the program level through the program review process.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Los Angeles Harbor College has a policy on Academic Freedom published in the College catalog.

13. FACULTY

The College employs 94 full-time contract faculty and approximately 200 part-time adjunct faculty members, not including full-time faculty teaching overloads.

The specific duties and responsibilities of faculty are delineated in the Faculty Handbook.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

The team found that the College strives to provide services to support its diverse student population and that are adequate to meet eligibility requirements. These services are consistent with the College's mission and purpose.

15. ADMISSIONS

Los Angeles Harbor College maintains an "open door" admission policy. This policy is consistent with the College Mission Statement, Education Code, Title 5 regulations and the statewide mission for California Community Colleges.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

Los Angeles Harbor College's Learning Resource Center (LRC) houses a variety of media collections and is staffed to assist students in their use. Internet access and online computer search capabilities are available without charge to students in the LRC and computer labs. The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) provides computer labs, individualized computer-assisted instruction and computer access to populations with special needs.
17. **FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Harbor College 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.

18. **FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The Team found that annual financial audits are conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants. The Board of Trustees reviews these audit reports on an annual basis. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions.

From Spring of 2003 through Fall 2005, Harbor College was under the financial oversight of a district wide Allocation Grant Taskforce. This had been brought about as a result of excessive deficits to the College in prior years. In the two years of this oversight, the College reduced its budget by $3.5 million dollars and ended the 2004-05 academic year within its budget. Budget cuts were implemented through mutual cooperation of the College Planning Council, the College Budget Committee, and the Academic Senate.

19. **INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION**

The visiting team confirmed that Los Angeles Harbor College provides basic planning for the development of the institution. Planning processes, however, need to be integrated, consistent and evaluated.

20. **PUBLIC INFORMATION**

All information required by the eligibility requirements is contained in the College catalog and on the College's well-designed web site (www.lahc.edu). The College also distributes a Fact Book annually. This reference guide documents quantitative data for the College over the past years and describes goals and future plans. This document is also available on the College's website.
21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The self study contained the requisite statement and signatories to certify that the institution adheres to the Eligibility Requirements and Standards of the Accrediting Commission.