

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

**East Los Angeles College
1301 Avenida César Chavez
Monterey Park, CA 91754**

**This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
East Los Angeles College March 7-10, 2016.**

**Pamela T. Luster, Ed.D
Chair**

NOTE: this page shall be added to the team report noted below, immediately behind the cover page, and shall become part of the final evaluation report associated with the review.

DATE: July 8, 2016

INSTITUTION: East Los Angeles College
1301 Avenida César Chávez
Monterey Park, CA 91754

TEAM REPORT: Comprehensive Evaluation Report

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

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

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

1. The Commission finds that the Eligibility Requirements 15 and 17 should not be cited as deficiencies in College Recommendation 5.
2. Remove College Recommendation 4, and in conjunction with College Recommendation 5, the College should submit a substantive change application for the South Gate Center.
3. The Commission has added a concern that the nursing program come into compliance with the Board of Registered Nursing's requirements as quickly as possible.
4. The Commission notes that references to a business continuity and/or disaster recovery plan should not be capitalized as in District Recommendation 4. The team's reference is to a general plan and not a specific plan with that title.

East Los Angeles College
External Evaluation Visit Team Roster
Monday, March 7-Thursday, March 10, 2016

Chair

Dr. Pamela Luster
President
San Diego Mesa College

Assistant

Dr. Danene Brown
Dean of Business and Technology, ALO
San Diego Mesa College

Dr. Patricia O'Hagan
Dean of EMS, Health Sciences, and Nursing
Kapiolani Community College

Ms. Catherine Shafer
Professor of Nursing
San Diego City College

Dr. Charles (Kale) Braden
Dean of Applied and Fine Arts
American River College

Dr. Richard Santos
Instructor, Linguistics/ESL
Fresno City College

Dr. Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza
Dean of Academic Support and Learning
Technologies
College of San Mateo

Dr. John Weispfenning
President
Santiago Canyon College

Dr. Melissa Raby
Vice President Student Services
Columbia College

Dr. Jeffrey Stephenson
Dean of Counseling & Student Services
American River College

Ms. Donna Berry
Vice President of Administrative Services
Reedley College

Ms. Sheri Sterner
Administrative Director, Research, Planning and
Institutional Effectiveness
Orange Coast College

**Los Angeles Community College District
External Evaluation Visit Team Roster
Monday, March 7-Thursday, March 10, 2016**

Chair

Dr. Helen Benjamin
Chancellor
Contra Costa Community College District

Assistant

Ms. Tammeil Y. Gilkerson
Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs
Contra Costa College

Ms. Linda Beam
Vice President Human Resources
El Camino College

Ms. Deborah Ludford
District Director of Information Services
North Orange County Community College District

Dr. Jannett Jackson
Chancellor
Chabot-Las Positas Community College
District

Dr. Jamey Nye
Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction
Los Rios Community College District

Mr. Dustin Johnson
Trustee
Los Rios Community College District

Dr. Lynn Neault
Vice Chancellor Student Services
San Diego Community College District Office

Mr. Doug Horner
Director of Facilities and Bond Program
Chabot-Las Positas CCD

Mr. Fred Williams
Interim Chancellor
North Orange County Community College District

Mr. Christopher Tarman
Senior Dean of Research, Planning,
and Institutional Effectiveness
Grossmont Cuyamaca Community College District

Summary of the External Evaluation

INSTITUTION: East Los Angeles College

DATES OF VISIT: March 7-10, 2016

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Pamela Luster

A twelve member accreditation team visited East Los Angeles College (ELAC) March 7-10, for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, provided recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitted a recommendation to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended Team Chair Training on December 2, 2015, and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on February 3, 2016. During this visit the team chair and team assistant met with campus leadership and key college constituents central to the creation of the institution's self-evaluation report. The entire external evaluation team received training provided by staff from ACCJC on January 26, 2016.

The team received the college's institutional self-evaluation document and related evidence within the timeframe required prior to the visit. Team members found it to be a comprehensive, well-written document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the institutional self-evaluation report was compiled through broad participation by the College community including all constituent groups. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful institutional self-evaluation report including its Quality Focus Essay.

On Sunday, March 6th, a representative group of the ELAC visiting team attended a welcome from the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Chancellor. The meeting included the other LACCD visiting teams, LACCD college presidents and others from the nine colleges in the district. The team chair and lead for Standard III met Monday morning, March 7th at the LACCD offices for an official welcome from the Chancellor, and a series of meetings with district office staff. Tuesday morning the team was formally welcomed and introduced to the college community by ELAC leaders and was given a tour of the campus before beginning its robust schedule of meetings and further review of evidence.

The team reviewed all of the evidence provided by the college in its institutional self-evaluation report. Specifically, the team reviewed documents and evidence supporting the Standards, Eligibility, Requirements, Commission Policies and USDE regulations. The team also reviewed major college documents, including all institutional plans, program review reports, enrollment information, and major standing committee minutes. The team reviewed the college's institution-set standards, and all processes and evidence related to learning outcomes and assessment.

The team was impressed with the level of support and collaboration from College leaders and others involved in the team visit. The team appreciated the College’s prompt response to requests for information and assistance with the team schedule of interviews.

The team found the College to be in compliance with most Eligibility Requirements, the majority of Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team discovered a number of effective practices and issued commendations for them. The team found that the College satisfies the majority of the Standards, but issued some recommendations to be in compliance, and to increase effectiveness.

The LACCD Visiting Team also issued commendations and recommendations at the district level which have been included in this report. The following is the delineation of the college and district team review process.

District Team Organization and Responsibilities

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

District Team Lead Responsibilities

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

III.D.1-16	Financial resources	As to District planning, systems, policies, practices
IV.A.3-5	Governance	As to policies and District procedures
IV.C.1-13	Governing Board	
IV.D.1-7	Multi-college districts	

District Team Support Responsibilities

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

College Commendations and Recommendations

College Commendations

1. The team commends the college for creating a welcoming environment, where students, staff, and faculty thrive in an enriched academic setting.
2. The team commends the college for engaging in robust and pervasive dialog across all constituent groups, and using the results of that dialog to improve practice.
3. The team commends the college and it's President for their level of commitment to institutional effectiveness through the comprehensive review, feedback and implementation of program review.
4. The team commends the college for planning and creating state-of-the art facilities and grounds, focused on students and the college community.
5. The team commends the college for being the cultural, social and educational center of the community, and on its unique achievement of creating lifelong student relationships, evidenced by the large number of graduates who have returned and are now serving as ELAC faculty and staff.
6. The team commends the college for its innovative outreach and partnerships with K-12 schools, encouraging youth in the community to consider college at the early stages of their lives.
7. The team commends the college for its vision in developing and implementing the GO East LA program through relationships with LAUSD, ELAC and local universities to provide unique bridge experiences for underrepresented students seeking higher education.
8. The team commends the college for its engaged student life programs, and congratulates the college on its remarkable student leaders.

College Recommendations for Compliance and Improvement

College Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college ensures student achievement and outcomes assessment data, at all levels, and where appropriate, be disaggregated and analyzed with regard to relevant subpopulations and modes of delivery (I.B.6).

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the college identify clearly defined institutional cycles for all types of outcomes assessment to assure all outcomes are assessed regularly and within a prescribed time frame (I.B.2; I.B.4).

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the college develop a systematic approach to ensure the college goal progress is routinely monitored and evaluated across master plans, program review and other planning efforts, and widely disseminate and discuss the results (I.B.5; I.B.8, I.B.9).

College Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirement, the team recommends that the college undertake a process that provides for the nursing program to fully comply with eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, commission policies, guidelines and requirements for public disclosure. (I.C.13; ER 21; II.A.14.)

College Recommendation 5 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the College must assess and implement a plan at its South Gate Educational Center to provide appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable student and learning support services to students. Additionally, the team recommends the institution has a sufficient number of staff to support the educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the South Gate Educational Center. (II.B.1, ER 17; II.C.1; II.C.2, II.C.3; ER 15)

College Recommendation 6 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness the team recommends that the institution establish a regular and systematic evaluation of its professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement. Additionally, the team recommends assessing the current distribution of professional development resources and opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators. (III.A.14)

College Recommendation 7 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a plan that continuously assesses, updates and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services. (III.C.2)

LACCD Commendations and Recommendations

District Commendations

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

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

District Commendation 3: The team commends the technology staff from the nine colleges and the District for their teamwork and collaboration in the areas of shared staff resources,

development of standards, collaborative training opportunities and deployment of integrated systems resulting in effective and efficient use of technology resources to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. (III.C.1, III.C.4)

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

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

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

District Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure all personnel are systematically evaluated at stated intervals in accordance with the bargaining agreements and Board policies. (III.A.5)

District Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District update the performance evaluations of academic administrators to include the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. (III.A.6)

District Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District and colleges develop a comprehensive Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan to ensure reliable access, safety, and security. (III.C.3)

District Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness and better assess financial resource availability, the team recommends that the District implement a District position control system to track and budget for personnel costs. (III.D.4)

District Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District comprehensively responds to the recurring audit findings concerning: 1) the internal control weakness in information technology controls over the areas of security and change management; and 2) the state compliance exceptions related to “To Be Arranged” (TBA) hours attendance documentation and course classifications. (III.D.7)

District Recommendation 7 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District develop and publicize a plan to fully fund the Other Post Employment Benefit (OPEB) Liability, which is currently funded at 16.06 percent. (III.D.12)

District Recommendation 8 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District develop a process to capture the full impact of the District’s liability for load banking and to record the liability in the District’s financial statements. (III.D.12)

District Recommendation 9 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District review the membership of institutional governance committees to ensure all employee groups, particularly classified staff, have formal input on institutional plans, policies, and other key considerations as appropriate. (IV.A.5)

District Recommendation 10 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board adopt policies that clearly define the process for the selection and evaluation of the chancellor. (IV.C.3)

District Recommendation 11 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board establish a formal process for approving the review of policies in which no revisions are made and to regularly assess the effectiveness of all policies in fulfilling the District mission. (IV.C.7)

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

Introduction

East Los Angeles (Junior) College (ELAC) was established in 1945 as a wing of Garfield High School. Student headcount was 380, and made up of primarily WWII Veterans. The College was permanently established in its present location in 1949 after the LA Board of Education purchased the 82 acre site. In the 1950's permanent buildings were constructed creating spaces for a comprehensive community college.

In 1969, the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) was established, and ELAC along with 8 other colleges were separated from the LA Unified School District and joined to create the new district. The ELAC service area encompasses Alhambra, Bell, Bell Gardens, City of Commerce, Cudahy, East Los Angeles, Maywood, Montebello, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, South San Gabriel, South Gate and Vernon.

The College has seen tremendous enrollment growth. In the 1990's the college grew from 13,000 students to 30,000 students, with the number of permanent faculty doubling. The College began its efforts to reach students who were located on the edge of their service area, and created the South Gate Educational Center. ELAC has benefitted in significant ways from several construction projects funded by LACCD's Measure's J, A, and AA. Over \$826 million has been dedicated to upgrading its facilities.

ELAC offers a comprehensive array of academic and student services, marked by new approaches to increase student success. Their unduplicated headcount as of Fall 2014 is 27,638 in credit programs, 1,424 in non-credit and 8,642 in public service academies for a total of 37,714 students. Their FTES as of 2014-2015 is 21,915 credit, 646 non-credit and 784 public service academies for a total of 23,345.

Demographic data reveal that a majority of ELAC students, 77.3%, are Hispanic/Latino, followed by 14.8% who are Asian/Pacific Islander, with other groups making up the remaining 8% of the student body. The college has a larger proportion of women than men, 67% to 33% respectively. The college's largest age group is under 25.

The college employs 290 full time faculty, and over 800 adjunct faculty. The ethnic make-up of the faculty is difficult to ascertain given that 32% of respondents marked unknown on as their ethnicity. The Classified staff number 305 and their diversity reflects the student and community demographic.

The College offers several programmatically accredited programs, Health Information Technology, Automobile Technology, Respiratory Therapy and Nursing. The Nursing Program was placed on warning in 2015, and is under quarterly review by the Board of Registered Nursing.

ELAC had its last comprehensive accreditation visit in March 2009. The Commission placed ELAC on Warning and required two follow-up reports in October 2009, and March 2010, and a follow-up visit. The college completed those reviews and was reaffirmed in June 2010. The College submitted its midterm report in 2012 which was accepted by the Commission. The College also submitted substantive change reports in 2010, 2011 and 2012, all of which were approved by the Commission

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that East Los Angeles College (ELAC) is authorized to operate as a post-secondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and granted authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that ELAC is operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs. As of 2014, the College enrollment is 27,638 in credit programs, 1,424 in non-credit and 8,642 in public service academies for a total of 37,714 students. Of those students, 28.1% are full time, with 71.5% identified as pursuing an educational goal of transfer, degree or career preparation.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed that 95% of ELAC's courses are degree applicable. The College offers 37 AA and AS programs as well as 18 Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). Degrees require a minimum of 60 units, and include General Education components, with major preparation concentration. The College offered 5,392 credit sections in the 2014-2015 academic year, providing access for prepared students to complete their degrees within a reasonable timeframe.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The team confirmed that the Governing Board of the LACCD employs a President as the chief executive officer and that he has full-time responsibility to the institution. The CEO reports to the Chancellor of LACCD; neither serves on the LACCD Board of Trustees. The team found that the Board and Chancellor vest appropriate authority in the President to administer policies and lead the College. All CEO changes have been reported to the ACCJC.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

5. Financial Accountability

The District Office Accounting Office staff oversees District wide audits and is responsible for coordination of all site visits. The District also has a Central Financial Aid Unit that monitors and helps control the Perkins Loans default rates. The District has Perkins Loans outstanding (over 240 days in default) totaling \$1.8 million, but

when compared to total loans outstanding for the District of \$270 million, the default rate is only approximately one percent of their outstanding principal. District staff continue to make collection calls to help reduce the default rates throughout the District. Discussion with staff revealed that the District is phasing out the Perkins Loan Program.

The Central Financial Aid Unit recently had a Perkins Loan Program site visit for Los Angeles Trade-Technical College by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) to follow up on high default rates over the last three years. The final report has not been received, but at the exit interview it was noted that while the rates were high, the USDE auditors were pleased with the collection efforts. Other compliance issues existed, but none related to the default rate.

The District annually undergoes an external financial audit by a certified public accountant that is made available to the public. Evidence shows that the audits were completed and are available to review on the District's website. Reports were available for the years ending June 30, 2001 through 2015.

Four colleges had a Perkins Loan default rate exceeding 30 percent for three straight years: West Los Angeles, Los Angeles Harbor, Los Angeles Pierce, and Los Angeles Trade-Technical. The total principal outstanding on loans in default exceeding 240 days for those four colleges (as of February 12, 2015) was \$874,202. The District is phasing out of the Perkins Loan Program and is moving to the Direct Loan Program. The published default rates for the Direct Loan Program are only available through fiscal year 2012. Of the nine colleges, only one (Los Angeles Trade-Technical College) had a rate over 30 percent and had only been in the program for one year.

The District meets the Eligibility Requirement.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

 X The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.

 X The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.

 X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment. [Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

 The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

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

Narrative:

The College posted its Institutional Self-Evaluation Report on the college website in October 2015, with notification to all college constituents. Additionally, the College held an Accreditation Forum in October, both hard copy and electronic comment forms were made available for feedback. The College presented the document to the major standing committees and constituent groups, Academic Senate, Department Chairs, ELAC Shared Governance Council and Associated Student Union throughout the Fall 2015 semester.

The College made available its materials so that the community would have an opportunity to comment, including to the LACCD Board of Trustees in November 2015. The team found no third party comments.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

 X The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement.

Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.

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

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

X The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a) (1) (i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

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

Narrative:

The College provided evidence that it has established and utilized institution-set standards beginning in 2013 for: course success, course retention, fall-to-fall persistence for first-time students, number of degrees awarded, number of certificates awarded and number of transfer to UC or CSU. The College has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has integrated the review of these elements in its annual program review process. The institution-set standards are relevant and guide the self-evaluation and institutional improvement. The College analyzes its outcomes with regard to these standards and student achievement.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

X Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).

X The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).

X Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

X Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.

X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*. [Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a) (1) (viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

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

Narrative:

The College utilizes the California Code of Regulations, Title V and district standards for clock hours, units, credit, competencies and degree requirements. BR 6201.10, 6201.12, 6201.14, 6202. The Curriculum Committee assures that the credit hours and degree program requirements meet all district and state requirements. Enrollment fees are set by the state and are consistent across all degree programs and are posted in the College Schedule and website.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

X Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.

X Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.

X The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a) (1) (viii); 602.17(a) (3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a) (ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

_____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

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

Narrative:

ELAC has policies for awarding credit, and they are posted in the College catalog. The policies contain clear information regarding the criteria used to accept credits for transfer. Board Rule 6701.10 specifies the requirements that satisfy courses and units for graduation and transfer. LACCD Administrative Regulations E-93, E-101, E-107, E-188, E-119, E-122 and E-123 define the types of credit that can be accepted for transfer, and the process for requesting approval of the credits.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

X The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.

X There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student’s grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily “paperwork related,” including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).

X The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.

X The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.

X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a) (1) (iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

_____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

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

Narrative:

ELAC has policies and procedures in place for defining and classifying courses offered as distance education. LACCD Administrative Regulation E-89 defined distance education. The College follows a six year cycle of review for all courses, including distance education.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.

The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.

The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.

The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a) (1) (ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

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

Narrative:

The College has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints. Board Rule XV addresses discrimination, and a student grievance process operates under Administrative Regulation E-55. The College also has a student complaint process and the college website

contain forms and clear steps for student to access them. A College ombudsman is appointed by the President to investigate these matters, with appropriate steps to resolution.

The College is missing consistent information regarding the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities. The college should review what information is available on the website and take corrective action to provide all information required.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

 X The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.

 X The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.

 X The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a) (1))(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

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

 The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

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

Narrative:

The College communicates all information about its programs in the College Catalog, Schedule of Classes and the college website. The website is easily navigable and contains all information to the public. The team found that all information regarding the College is accurately reflected in its publication and electronic resources.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

 X The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.

X The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.

 X The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.

 X Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.

 X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a) (1) (v); 602.16(a) (1) (x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

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

_____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

_____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College provided evidence in its Institutional Self-Evaluation Report to demonstrate that it complies with all items of Title IV.

Standard I

Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

Standard I.A: Mission

General Observations

East Los Angeles College has a clearly defined and focused mission statement. The college's mission has been approved by its governing board and evidence shows the mission guides its decision making. The mission statement meets all requirements, is publicized widely, shows its commitment to student learning, and is known to campus constituents. The mission is prominent on the college's website, catalog, and schedule of classes and posted publicly around the campus. The college's strategic plan, master plans and program review purposefully support the college's mission. As such, the college's integrated planning process is directly related to and supporting the college's mission. Although distance education is not clearly delineated in its mission, the college views distance education as a vehicle to increase access and better serve the needs of its non-traditional students. The mission is reviewed annually to ensure it is meeting the needs of the college's intended student population and its focus on student learning.

Findings and Evidence

The college has a mission statement that encompasses its broad educational purpose, four college goals that outline its intended student population and its commitment to student learning, and a concluding statement that describes the types of degrees and credentials it offers. Distance education is viewed at the college as a scheduling option to extend access and many of the students are not exclusively distance education students. As such, there is no explicit reference to distance education in the mission statement (I.A.1; ER 6).

The college states it uses student performance data as the foundation for its objectives, college master plan and program review. The data is the underlying factor that links plans to the mission. The college's master plans set the objectives, action plans and evaluation targets for the four goals explicitly linked to the mission, the college's program review and planning model drives the allocation of resources for all academic and support programs. Each program's comprehensive review and annual update is routed in its contribution to the college mission. The development of the Strategic Plan and master plans are based on internal and external scan data, providing the basis for the master plan to meet students and community needs. The mission statement for their SLO process is the link between assessment and educational quality (I.A.2).

The college's strategic plan is derived from the college's mission statement and the LACCD goals. The strategic plan encompasses the college's vision, mission and goals. The college goals are aligned with the LACCD Strategic Plan goals. The college's master plans (i.e., Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan and Technology Master Plan) specifically detail objectives and action items related to the college goals as applicable to the plan area. The college's Educational Planning Subcommittee oversees the Educational Master Plan and ensures plans/action plans are aligned with the goals in the mission statement. The college

has similar subcommittees for technology (Technology Planning Subcommittee) and facilities (Facilities Planning Subcommittee) that oversee and ensure these plans are consistent with the Strategic Plan (1.A.3).

The college's comprehensive program review and annual program updates directly align with the college goals and lead directly to resource allocation. Action items in the master plans may overlap with program review strategies and are part of a programs' annual update. Master plan action items that are not included in a programs' annual update report their progress directly to the subcommittee. The college also employs strategic task forces to respond to immediate or focused needs not clearly outlined in the master plans. The task force topics allow the college the flexibility of meeting students' changing needs while not usurping the master plans. These are aligned with the college's mission and goals, and mainstreamed into the college's annual updates and resource allocation processes (1.A.3).

The mission has been adopted by the Board of Trustees on July 8, 2015 after a campus-wide review by the college's constituents. College constituents indicate they are familiar with the mission statement and feel it serves as the basis for college planning. The college's mission statement is formally included in its Strategic Plan and it is reviewed annually according to the planning calendar contained in the Governance Policy Handbook (I.A.4, ER 6).

Conclusions: The college meets the standard and Eligibility Requirement 6.

Standard IB: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

Overall, the college is meaningfully engaged in the required institutional effectiveness processes across all campus departments (i.e., program review, outcomes assessment and annual/long-term planning). Dialog is pervasive and robust, leading to a wider dissemination and understanding of program review, outcomes assessment and planning results across the college. Additionally, the dialog reflects an environment that fosters empowerment, inclusion, and innovation. The college's shared governance committees play a central role in the development, evaluation and implementation of program review, outcomes assessment and planning. A culture of evidence is evident and is growing on the campus. Student achievement data is standardized, accessible and generally of the appropriate breadth and depth. The availability of data to the college and public is expanding and responding to the needs of the college. Increasingly, programs and departments are centering their operations about data supported approaches and planning.

Findings and Evidence

The college has developed processes and a culture that supports and encourages dialog leading to continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. The college has recently embarked on efforts to increase their student equity planning and dialog across campus. Evidence of enhanced dialog around course SLOs and student equity was cited in the self-evaluation. Long-term and widespread dialog occurs for academic quality and institutional effectiveness, primarily through the program review and outcomes assessment process. The annual update process ensures program review and outcomes assessment results are reviewed and discussed across shared governance committees. Other examples of evidence in terms of academic quality dialog were found through the New Faculty Institute (NFI), Cultivating Excellence Initiative, and surrounding distance education. (I.B.1).

The college has officially defined what constitutes a program for outcomes assessment. As such, college has developed program learning outcomes for all academic programs as well as student service outcomes. The college has developed processes, guidelines and accountability for these program outcomes. The college utilizes an electronic database, TracDat, to record and maintain learning outcomes data and processes. Program learning outcome and student services outcome assessment is integrated into program review and annual updates. Program outcomes are published in the college catalog (I.B.2, ER 11).

Based on the evidence provided, the majority of program outcomes (93%) and student service outcomes (75%) have been assessed. Throughout the report, different completion percentages were published, and the college should align these within their reports. The evidence of specific programs supplied show certain outcomes assessed within a department, but not all departmental outcomes. During interviews with the college, the team was told that the college has an established a three-year cycle for course outcomes assessment, but no defined cycle for program outcomes, institutional outcomes, student services outcomes or administrative unit outcomes. Based on the evidence reviewed by the team, it is evident the majority of programs are meaningfully engaged and participating in SLO/SSO/AUO assessment. However, the discrepancy in completion percentages and lack of completion of

all outcomes within a department suggest the lack of an institutionally defined cycle may be causing an issue in reporting and/or implementation (I.B.2, ER 11).

The college has developed institution-set standards appropriate to their mission: course success, course retention, fall-to-fall persistence, certificate completion, degree completion and transfer. The development of the college-wide institutional level standards were vetted and discussed widely across the college. Evidence indicates robust dialog through their shared governance structure about the indicators, options for measurement and institution-set standard. The team finds that the institution-set standards are appropriately set given the data available on student learning outcomes and student achievement. IEPI goals were submitted to the Board of Trustees for formal approval on June 10, 2015. The standards were set to reflect a “floor” or low point for performance rather than an aspirational goal. The college has set an aspirational goal for course completion for the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Institute, which is separate from the institution-set standards (I.B.3, ER 11).

The college is in process of reviewing program level set standards through their annual update process. The college states that disciplines are currently setting course success/retention standards and programs are setting standards for completion and will be complete in 2016-17. Beyond setting a standard, there are no guidelines or expectations on how programs are to set standards or evaluate their performance against standards. Specifically, the Nursing program has licensure exam pass rates that fall well below State requirements. The program falls below its own institution-set standards, and failed to meet established program learning outcomes. AUPs for the Nursing Program do not clearly identify plans for improvement; most recent Clinical Advisory Board meetings do not address continued substandard pass rates and plans to improve program and/or progress related to those plans. Quarterly reports to the Board of Registered Nursing provided by ELAC personnel outline a variety of interventions but do not include an evaluation of effectiveness of those interventions. Lack of effectiveness of the plans is evidenced by continued licensure exam pass rates below state standards and institutional set standards. The continued substandard pass rates indicate that program completers are not meeting minimum requirements of the profession, therefore not achieving the established program learning outcomes. Review of faculty meeting minutes identify many notations indicating that students are not achieving outcomes, but do not include reasonable plans to address the issues. Most notably, minutes from November 2015, indicate that clinical challenges creates a risk for patient safety. Finally, there is no evidence that the program status assigned by the Board of Registered Nursing is made available in print format. This program shows very little evidence of academic quality. (I.B.3, ER 11).

The college provides selected evidence of outcomes assessment and student achievement data that has culminated in improvements to student learning and/or student achievement. While the college states it organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement, the evidence provided for this standard are examples and the college does not address, specifically, which processes produced these results and if there is a consistent cycle of reporting detailing improvements. During interviews with the college, the team observed that the program review and outcomes assessment processes play a central role in program improvement. Program review is conducted on a systematic schedule, as is

outcomes assessment; however the college could increase its effectiveness by aligning assessment cycles across all of its planning processes. (I.B.4).

The college's master plans and program review are the primary vehicles the college uses to assess its accomplishment of the mission. The college has an established program review process with annual updates that include an evaluation of student achievement and outcomes assessment data. Evidence provided by the college shows that annual updates have been in place since at least 2011-2012. The college's program review is widespread, occurring in all academic and support departments across the college. The team verified the program review process integrates the college mission and goals. The annual update plans detail each program's progress on their strategies linked to the college goals. Student learning outcomes and achievement data are part of the program review analyses (I.B.5).

The three master plans directly align with the Strategic Plan; however, they were not developed purposefully in alignment with each other. Interviews with the college indicate that while the plans were not developed in alignment with each other, a task force of the Educational Master Plan Committee has been developed to evaluate alignment of the Educational Master Plan with the other master plans. Interviews with the college indicated the lack of a systematic process to monitor progress of college goals across master plans. Lack of staffing for the planning function to assist committees in systematically gathering and aggregating information was cited by multiple groups that the team interviewed. An executive summary of goal progress is provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement to the Board of Trustees annually. Evidence of the extent to which this summary is shared within the college was not found and multiple interview groups did not seem to be aware of this top level summary or any comprehensive report on the college's achievement of the goals nor is it clear if this summary includes goal achievement items from program review (I.B.5).

The team found pockets of disaggregated student achievement and outcomes assessment data. A standard set of program review data is provided to all academic programs undergoing review. Academic program data provided as part of the program review process is disaggregated by demographics, schedule and mode of delivery. Achievement in terms of course completion is provided only in the Distance Education program review and did not provide a comparative analysis of other modalities. While the college has set a 70% institution-set standard for all courses, including modality, the Distance Education program review does not adequately analyze distance education course completion rates, evidenced by the recommendations from the review process memo. In summary, while evidence of disaggregation of student achievement data is provided, distance education at the program level as it is not embedded within departments and not analyzed as a distance education program, and is therefore lacking. No evidence of regularly collected disaggregated outcomes assessment data across all types was found (I.B.6).

The college provided evidence of ongoing evaluation of its program review, outcomes assessment and planning processes. Many of the evaluative activities center on informal feedback leading to process improvement with committee members or process leads responsible for implementation or improvement of the processes. Although their evaluative data was not broad-based and involving all college members affected by the processes, substantive and meaningful improvements too many processes have been made. (I.B.7).

The college has made available a variety of data and information to the college and the public. These include information about the college's course, program and institutional outcomes results, institution-set standards, college facts, program review, annual plans and program viability. In addition to information and data increasingly being made accessible on the public website, the college provides opportunities for dialog and participation through its shared governance committee structure. Although information and participation opportunities are made available and those interviewed felt it was adequate, no evidence is provided that the larger campus community (i.e., faculty, staff and management not participating in committees) feel this is adequate. Evidence is provided that students agree they can find a variety of information at an acceptable level. While the college has made a variety of program-based assessment and evaluation evidence is made available, information about the results of evaluation of the overarching processes or governance structure is absent (I.B.8).

The college's outcomes assessment, program review and planning processes appear to be integrated and focused around achieving the college's missions and goals. All academic and non-academic departments are engaged in these processes, and they are routed through the college's participatory governance committees. The college's annual updates address short-term needs while the master plans address longer-term needs for human, physical and technology. The program review process includes aggregating program review into cluster plans. Cluster plans serve as a summarization and prioritization point for plans and resource requests within the cluster area. Prioritization of resource requests is done by the Vice Presidents for their cluster and then priorities integrated across areas with the Vice President's and President. The college provided many examples of these processes leading to direct program improvement. The team found some evidence of how these resources were assessed, and linked back to the cycle of assessment over time; however the team could not find evidence of a sustained and linked effort in all program areas. (I.B.9, ER 19).

Conclusions: The college meets the standard with the exception of I.B.6.

College Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college ensures student achievement and outcomes assessment data, at all levels, be disaggregated and analyzed with regard to relevant subpopulations and modes of delivery (I.B.6).

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the college identify clearly defined institutional cycles for all types of outcomes assessment to assure all outcomes are assessed regularly and within a prescribed time frame (I.B.2; I.B.4).

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the college develop a systematic approach to ensure the college goal progress is routinely monitored and evaluated across master plans, program review and other planning efforts, and widely disseminate and discuss the results (I.B.5; I.B.8, I.B.9).

Standard IC: Institutional Integrity

General Observations:

The College demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication through appropriate documentation such as board policy citations, printed college materials such as catalogs and handbooks, and the College website. The college uses assessment data of student learning and evaluation to discuss matters of academic quality to students, former students, the campus community and the public.

Within the college catalog and on its website, the institution describes its degrees and certificates and provides detailed information about course offerings. The catalog is reviewed yearly to update policies, program and course information. Information found in the catalog and on the website is accurate and correct. Current and prospective students can find information regarding student fees and textbook and material costs. The institution publishes in its board policies and on course syllabi, information on academic integrity and academic freedom. Information on student behavior, academic honesty and consequences are clearly written and can easily be located.

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

Findings and Evidence: The team found evidence that the college demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication through appropriate documentation such as board policy citations, printed college materials such as catalogs and handbooks, and the College website (I.C.1, ER 20).

The College provides a catalog that contains extensive information for the student with clear policies detailed within the catalog and on the website. The college updates its college catalog regularly online and in print every two years. The two-year print catalog cycle was due to a change in student information systems and the college plans to resume an annual printing in 2016. The College’s website is very easy to navigate and information can be found easily and quickly. The college’s process includes a multi-level review among a variety of stakeholders and ensures an accurate catalog is produced. The production of the college catalog is overseen by an academic dean and its production is a joint effort of the Curriculum Committee Chair, Articulation Officer, Admissions representatives and graphic artist. In addition, content is managed by appropriate areas as delegated by the Vice Presidents. Student learning outcomes are included on the course syllabus. The college provides a Possible Course Syllabus Items checklist for faculty as a guide to create a syllabus. One item on the list includes academic integrity. Additionally, LACCD Board Rules, Chapter VI Article VII 6703.10 contains information about referencing student code of conduct in the individual syllabus. Students do have access to certain learning resources such as free online Writing Lab and Tutorial services. Students can also file certain forms such as the FAFSA

online but they must appear in person to submit forms required for verification purposes (I.C.1; ER 20; I.C.2).

The college makes its student achievement and outcomes assessment data and results available to the public on the college's website. Student achievement data is made public through the Student Success Scorecard, College Profile, College at a Glance and within the published program review results. The College provides links to various information regarding student success data including the Chancellor's Office Student Success Scorecard, a website that contains all research on retention rates, completion, transfer, and degrees and certificates awarded. Student outcomes assessment data and results for PLOs and SSOs/AUOs is also made available to the public on the college's website. Results are from verifiable sources, including the State Chancellor's Office and directly extracted TracDat reports (I.C.3; ER 19).

The college provides information about its degrees and certificates in its college catalog. In addition to the degree and certificate titles, the catalog provides an overview of the department, a description about the purpose of each degree/certificate, content course requirements, the program outcomes, and the required/optional courses. In standard I.C.4, the college does not describe its process to ensure this information is accurate. However, the college does describe the college catalog process in detail in I.C.2, in which the curriculum committee chair, articulation officer and departments are involved in the development and review of the catalog. In a review of various syllabi, the documents contain student learning outcomes and course objectives (I.C.4).

The College has fifteen standing shared governance committees that review policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity. There are several levels of review before the policy or procedure is finally approved by the President. The team found evidence about the various procedures that the college uses to develop a new policy (I.C.5).

The College provides clear information regarding total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses within the catalog as well as on the College's website and also within the Financial Aid website. Specific instructional materials are also noted in the Course Schedule that is published each semester. The college's catalog and schedule of classes provides students and prospective students information about all costs. In addition, the college makes publically available the net price calculator on the college's website (I.C.6).

The Board's policy on academic freedom specifies the faculty's right to teach and the student's right to learn. The colleges widely publish their commitment to a learning environment that promotes free expression of thought and ideas in the college catalogs and some include it in the class schedule. The District's faculty contract (AFT) specifies that faculty shall have the *freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning for students*. The faculty contract also outlines the policies and procedures for protection of academic freedom. (I.C.7; ER 13).

The college provides evidence of clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. They provide evidence of a general policy and for distance education. In reviewing the policies and procedures to promote honesty,

responsibility, and academic integrity, the Self-Evaluation does describe the procedures used if complaints are filed. During the site visit a review of complains or violations of policies need to be reviewed to insure they were addressed in timely manner and follows the policies that are outline in policy, on the Website, and within the catalog. The team found evidence of authentication processes for students who are at a distance. The processes appear to be adequate and serve to identify the student. In a review of syllabi, the documents contain statements regarding academic honesty and consequences that may occur should dishonesty occur.

The Los Angeles Community College District demonstrates a clear commitment to academic integrity and personal responsibility. The District has established, and routinely publishes, Board policies and administrative regulations that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity that apply to all constituencies, including students taking online classes (Board Rules 9803-9806 and 91101). Polices include definitions of, and expectations for, honest and ethical behavior. The District has a student code of conduct which includes academic honesty. The District also has policies and procedures for addressing student discipline and complaints. These policies and procedures are communicated to students in college catalogs and on the District and college websites. In accordance with Board Rule 6703.10, faculty are required to include an expectation of academic integrity for students in their class syllabi. (I.C.8)

The Board of Trustee's policy on Academic Freedom is contained in Article 4 of the LACCD's Agreement with the American Federation of Teachers College Guild. The Academic Senate's Policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility complements the LACCD's Board of Trustee policy on Academic Freedom. The Academic Senate's policy requests faculty to refrain from using the classroom as an area to proclaim viewpoints unrelated to their subject matter. The policy sets expectations for faculty distinguishing between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in their disciplines. Further, the college provides evidence that the majority of students feel that their instructors present information fairly and objectively, distinguishing between personal conviction and professionally accepted views (I.C.9).

The college is a public community college and does not instill specific beliefs or worldviews. The college has specific policies on academic freedom, sexual harassment, and diversity. The LACCD's Personnel Commission Employee Handbook and the Student Code of Conduct and Student Rights in the College Catalog detail the specific codes of conduct for each constituent group (I.C.10). The college does not operate in any foreign locations (I.C.11).

The college complies with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission polices and public disclosure guidelines. The College's website contains all actions from the ACCJC and the Catalog contains the information that the college is accredited by ACCJC. (I.C.12)

The College holds accreditation from external agencies for Respiratory Therapy and Health Information Technology, and external approval for Emergency Medical Technician and Nursing. While the licensure pass rates are publicly available on the college website, other

required information, such as the external approving agency and program status, is not listed in the college's print or electronic catalog. Additionally, the team reviewed college evidence to include the Board of Registered Nursing mandate of 2014 stating the enrollment limits for the program to be 48; clinical advisory board meeting minutes (2015) identify 56 students were admitted to the program suggesting potential disregard for an external accreditors directives for compliance. (I.C.13, ER 21).

The college ensures its commitment to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount through its established program review, outcomes assessment and planning processes. Such processes are strongly aligned with the mission. Strategies and action plans are linked to resource allocation, prioritized and publicly reported to the campus community through these processes (I.C.14).

Conclusion: The College meets all standards except I.C.13 and ER21.

College Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard and Eligibility Requirement, the team recommends that the college undertake a process that provides for the nursing program to fully comply with eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, commission policies, guidelines and requirements for public disclosure. (I.C.13; ER 21; II.A.14, II.A.16.)

Los Angeles Community College District meets the Standard. (I.C.7; 1.C.8) The District has a number of policies and administrative regulations in place to promote honesty, responsibility, ethical conduct, and academic integrity that apply to all forms of delivery and constituencies, including visitors to the campuses. There are several commendable practices pertaining to academic integrity at the various colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD).

Standard II. Student Learning Programs and Support Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations

The team found that the college's instructional programs are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission. The curriculum committee process and procedures ensure that these programs are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education. The curriculum committee procedures ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.

The College identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees through their Assessment committee, Program Reviews, Annual Updates, and curricular reviews. The degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning and schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in higher education.

The Faculty at ELAC appear to be dedicated to their profession and passionate about helping students succeed. Their degrees and programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core and graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees at ELAC demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed at ELAC, the college makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

Findings and Evidence

Through a review of ELAC's mission statement, *ELAC Curriculum Committee: Purpose and Role* document, *ELAC Curriculum Committee: Purpose and Rules* document, the team found ample evidence that ELAC's instructional programs are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs (II.A.1; ER 9; ER 11)

The review of curriculum committee procedures also provided evidence that Faculty ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. A review of the Annual Update Data Packs provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) to facilitate program reviews, the *ELAC DE Program Instructor Handbook* provided evidence that faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly

related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success (II.A.2).

A review of the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) listed on the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Reports Database compared with the college catalog, a random review of course syllabi, and interviews with department chairs and division deans, the team collected evidence which demonstrates that the institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and kept current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section, students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline (II.A.3).

The team reviewed curriculum process and procedures, Annual Update Plans from the Writing Center and Math Lab, the college catalog, and interviews with counselors and basic skills faculty. The team found that ELAC distinguishes that curriculum from college level curriculum and directly supports students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum (II.A.4).

The team reviewed LACCD Board Rules pertaining to Curriculum Committee policies and procedures, the Proposed New Program Request form, and conducted interviews with the curriculum committee and articulation officer. The team found degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The institution ensures that minimum degree requirements are 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate level. (II.A.5; ER 12).

Through a review of the Program Review Process, the Program Viability Review process, interviews with members of the Enrollment Management Committee, deans, and department chairs, the team found that the institution schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in higher education (II.A.6; ER 9).

The team review of syllabi from a variety of courses (CTE, liberal arts, science, and general education) indicates ELAC faculty utilize a variety of teaching and grading modalities the meet the needs of various learning styles. The office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) distributes an annual report profiling the student population, which includes demographics, goals, placement results, and outcomes. The College's Equity Plans addresses the goals, objectives, and the action items taken to reduce equity gaps. ELAC effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students, in support of equity in success for all students (II.A.7).

The team evaluated data regarding how both the TEAS exam and the Accuplacer exam are evaluated for validity and bias by ATI, the company that developed the TEAS and Accuplacer, respectively to determine that the institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations including direct assessment of prior

learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability (II.A.8).

The team evaluated documents from the ELAC Curriculum Committee, a random sample of Course Outlines of Record, LACCD board policies and rules, and conducted interviews with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and found evidence of established awarding of course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. The team confirmed that the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions (II.A.9; ER 10)

Through reviews of curriculum committee minutes, policies and procedures of the curriculum committee, interviews with the articulation officer, and a review of the ASSET website the team established that ELAC makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of student without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission (II.A.10; ER 10).

Through a review of committee minutes, a review of a random selection of Course Outlines of Record, syllabi, the Institutional Learning Outcomes, GE Learning Outcomes, and interviews with department chairs, members of the curriculum committee, and members of the assessment committee the team established that ELAC includes learning outcomes appropriate to the program level, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes (II.A.11).

Through a review of the college catalog, Board Rules, curriculum committee process and procedures, Academic Senate positions and interviews with a broad selection of faculty administrators and staff, the team found evidence that ELAC requires of all its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The general education outcomes are assessed alongside the Institutional Learning Outcomes and evidence of assessment are evident in practice. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, has determined the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include a student's preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences (II.A.12: ER 12).

A review of the college catalog and self-study provides evidence that degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. Courses included within the field of study reflect the identified PLO. For example, the

Animation program of study has identified the following PLO: “The student completing the Art Program of Study will enhance their visual literacy through the acquisition of observational, technical, and analytical skills.” Courses within this program of study include courses in fundamentals of animation, layout and background art, digital imaging, and history of animation (II.A.13).

Through a review of advisory committee minutes and interviews with CTE faculty and deans, the team established that graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees at ELAC demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification. The team found processes in place that ensure programs are aligned with labor market demands and content that is relevant to employers. Evidence from the Nursing program outcomes and licensure data is troubling in terms of the low success rate of its graduates, and low number of graduates. Additionally, the program is on path to lose its accredited status by the BRN. (II.A.14).

Through a review of Board Rule 2803.10, the *Expedited Program Viability Review* process from the ELAC Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and discussions with department chairs and deans the team established that when programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption (II.A.15).

Review of ELAC documentation shows the College has an established program review and self-evaluation (PRSE) process that includes full program review every 6 years, with updates annually. The program review process includes a review of program learning outcomes, identification of program needs, resources required, and areas for improvement. Review of program outcomes allows ELAC personnel to identify challenges for students to successfully complete programs, a discussion of equity and a reflection of lessons learned. The PRSE requires a description of how the program meets the mission of the college as well as a six year plan for future goals that links to the College master plans. Curricular review, trends that affected the program and plans for developing new courses are included in the PRSE process. Data for program review is provided by the office of institutional research and effectiveness, and includes completion rates, retention, and degrees and certificates awarded (II.A.16).

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements, except for II.A.14.

College Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard and Eligibility Requirement, the team recommends that the college undertake a process that provides for the nursing program to fully comply with eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, commission policies, guidelines and requirements for public disclosure. (I.C.13; ER 21; II.A.14.)

Standard II.B. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

East Los Angeles College supports student learning and achievement by offering a number of academic support resources and services to faculty, students, and staff at both the main campus and South Gate Educational Center.

The newly renovated Helen Miller Bailey Library at the main campus and South Gate Educational Center library offer students, staff, and faculty access to a collection of resources to support instruction. Resources include over 100,000 print books, 60,000 e-books, over 90,000 online databases, 1,600 audio-visual materials, 85 print periodicals, a course reserve collection with over 600 course textbooks, numerous computer stations, printers, photocopiers, several study room areas, and workstations to accommodate users with disabilities. Both libraries provide services to distance learning students. Additional services consist of a Research Help Desk and Live Online Chat Reference, Drop-in Workshops, Class Orientations, Library Science Credit Courses, and Online Research Guides.

Learning Assistance Centers, Writing Centers, Math Labs, and 20 departmental support labs provide tutorial support and computer-assisted instruction in more than 17 different disciplines. Tutoring sessions include one-to-one and small group sessions. Centers make available to students a variety of books, materials, anatomy models, CD's and DVD's. The Learning Assistance Center offers support to over 5,000 students. The Writing Centers provide one-on-one writing conferences with English instructors, a library of literature, film, textbooks, reference materials, and tutorials on writing skills and grammar workshops. The Math Tutoring Centers staff consists of student tutors and math faculty that assist students with mathematical writing and problem solving in all levels. Books, calculators, and computers are available for use in the Math Tutoring Centers. There are several other departmental specific academic support labs on the main campus: Adelante First-Year Experience, GANAS, MESA, and Mathematics Supplemental Instruction. No Learning Assistance Center exists at the South Gate Educational Center.

Recent updates:

The Learning Assistance Center and Writing Center is now centrally located in the Language Arts Building at East Los Angeles College. The relocation of the two centers should increase the capacity for assisting students. The library went through an extensive remodel within the last five years and has transformed its offerings and services to reflect the emerging digital age.

The Writing Center stated in their Annual Update Plan the difficulty in finding qualified tutors. This difficulty arises from a District policy requiring tutors to enroll in twelve or more units a semester, hindering their ability to increase capacity. However, the Center can employ part-time students through grants.

The Writing Center also mentioned in their Annual Update Plan the difficulty in getting data to make program improvements. All centers use C-I Track for their attendance tracking system. This system captures data of student participation but not the service activities that

the students request. The Writing Center would benefit from acquiring software that can capture the data they need for making informed decisions.

A classified staff position has been approved to oversee math tutoring at the South Gate Educational Center. East Los Angeles College should find opportunities to hire additional staff to support tutorial services and extend hours of operation in the libraries and learning centers at both sites.

Findings and Evidence

East Los Angeles College has three main areas that provide academic support: the Libraries, Centers, and departmental specific programs. The libraries at both sites offer a variety of resources and services to aid students in their educational needs. The main campus has extensive collections of books, e-books, databases, and other reader collections. Two floors in the library contain approximately 88 computers, 24 express stations, three community computers, two scanners, and one printer. There are five printers that print in both black and white and seven photocopiers available for students. Electronic resources are growing and the reserved book collection contains approximately 80 course textbooks. The library offers both face-to-face and online help. Online assistance can be accessed 24/7. Face-to-face assistance is available during working hours through librarians manning the information and reference desks. Online can be accessed 24/7 provided through a collaboration with the Question Point 24/7 Cooperative, where a librarian is on call at all times of the day. Faculty can schedule library orientations for students to help with research assignments. Numerous study rooms are available for group study. Services for students with disabilities are also provided. The library also offers professional development to faculty and staff.

East Los Angeles College's, three learning centers offer student support: Learning Assistance Center, Writing Center, and Mathematics Tutorial Center. Each provides various tutorial services. The Learning Assistance Center services provide 30 minute one-on-one, small group tutoring sessions, as well as walk-in tutorials in approximately 17 disciplines. This center provides one online tutor for online support. Twenty hours a week of online tutoring through NetTutor will begin during the spring 2016. The Mathematics Tutorial Center provides drop-in; open ended tutoring that allows students to work on their course assignments at their own pace. Students will ask for tutorial assistance as needed. This assistance will last between three to five minutes. The Writing Centers provides thirty-minute appointments. Students make appointments online, drop in appointments are accepted as well. The South Gate Educational Center has minimal learning support services for students.

East Los Angeles College provides over 20 departmental and specially funded program learning support labs. Examples cited in the report are Adelante, First-Year Experience, Goals and Needs to Accelerate STEM (GANAS), MESA, and Mathematical Supplemental Instruction. Other examples are DSP&S and EOPS/CARE. (Standard II.B.1; ER17)

Librarians and content faculty, work in unison to expand the printed and online collections. For example, through dialog with the ESL department, the main campus library houses a collection of books for second language learners. The library also bases their new selections on the reviews from the prominent resources and reviews such as the Library Journal, American Libraries, and Choice. They rely on the California Community College

Consortium's Electronic Access and Resource's Committee website to "keep abreast" of any new databases. With the ever-increasing cost of databases and more students accessing electronic resources over hardcover books, the library relies on lottery funds, instructional materials funds, and external grant funding to pay for their collection (II.B.2)

The library and tutoring centers faculty and staff use assessment data to inform their practices and academic support resources. All areas have completed multiple assessment cycles. (Evidence: Library Program of Service Report 2015, Library Student Satisfaction Survey 2015, Library PSO Assessment Results, Library Student Satisfaction Survey 2013, LAC Assessment Results, Writing Center Learning Outcomes and Math Tutoring SSOs, and 2014 LACCD Student Survey) The library has six Program Service Outcomes (PSOs). Three surveys measuring student satisfaction have been administered since 2012. In most cases, the library met their benchmarks. However, the survey results show that the sample size was extremely small for an institution this size. The Learning Assistance Center and the Mathematics Tutoring Center both have PLOs that state students who attend tutorial sessions will pass their classes with a C or better. The evidence shows that this is true.

The Team visited South Gate Educational Center and discovered that tutoring support is not provided at the level sufficient for a campus off site center. The college has not conducted a substantive change report for South Gate Educational Center, and thus has not created or implemented a fully developed plan for this site. (II.B.3)

ELAC has reciprocal borrowing agreements with Cal State LA, UCLA, and sister colleges in LACCD. Safety measures are in place in both the main campus and South Gate Educational Center. (II.B.4 and Eligibility Requirement 17)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standards and related Eligibility Requirements, except as follows:

College Recommendation 5 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the College must assess and implement a plan at its South Gate Educational Center to provide appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable student and learning support services to students. Additionally, the team recommends the institution has a sufficient number of staff to support the educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the Southgate Education Center. (II.B.1, ER 17; II.C.1; II.C.2, II.C.3; ER 15)

Standard II.C. Student Support Services

General Observations

East Los Angeles Community College (ELAC) has a wide variety of support services that are offered to their diverse student body of nearly 30,000 credit students including approximately 4,500 students attending at the South Gate Educational Center, 1,700 at other offsite locations, and 1,200 online/hybrid. The services provided are comprehensive and traditional for a public community college in California. Support services include Admissions, Assessment/Matriculation, Associated Student Union (ASU), Athletics, CalWORKs, Career & Job Services, Child Development Center, Counseling Department, Disabled Students Program and Services (DSPS), Distance Education, Equal Opportunities Program and Services (EOPS)/Cooperative Agencies Resource for Education (CARE), Financial Aid, First Year Experience (FYE/Adelante), Student Health Center, International Students Program, MESA, Outreach/Offsite and Recruitment, Puente, Student Activities, Veterans Resource Center (VRC). Comprehensive services are evident at the ELAC main campus, however, only a limited number of support services are offered to distance education students and to students at the South Gate Educational Center (SGEC).

The college periodically assesses student support services through faculty and staff dialog, and surveys. While the institution has made progress in developing and assessing program outcomes and has instituted a program review process, there is a visible need for establishing methods for using assessment results to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. Each program responds to how it addresses the institutional goals and includes Student Services Outcomes (SSOs). The President responds to each completed comprehensive program review with any commendations and/or recommendations, thus closing the loop of the review cycle.

Findings and Evidence

The College evaluates the quality of student support services through a process that includes a seven-year comprehensive program review and annual updates that are included in the Student Services Cluster Plan. The Student Services Cluster Plan is currently being updated and was not available to review during the team's visit. The college has utilized some student surveys to assess program needs. Examples include point of service surveys, student feedback from probation and dismissal workshops, new student online orientation, and the Transfer Fair. Several examples were provided to the team demonstrating program improvement including extended hours, changes to the online orientation, and the addition of financial literacy workshops. Another example, the Student Services point of service survey, utilized outdated samples (2011) due to turnover within the Counseling Department and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The department chair for counseling has only been in the position for a little over a month and plans to conduct further research on the needs of the students (interview with Counseling Director).

ELAC identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate support services and programs. SSOs have been developed for all programs and each program has completed the program review cycle. SSOs are assessed to recognize the changes needed to improve the particular student services program. Not all

areas, however; are at the sustainability stage of the evaluation cycle per Program Review recommendations. Athletics, International, Student Health, Outreach, and Student Activities are at the Awareness, Developmental, or Proficiency stages (Program Review Reports and Recommendations). Evidence of a program at the proficiency level is Admissions and Records who launched an awareness campaign to address the SSO of increasing the percentage of course grade submissions which resulted in 96% of grades being submitted by the due date. Also the College, through its student achievement data, identified the need to improve institutional transfer rates. The college created the Transfer Taskforce to address increasing the number of successful transfers. There has been an obvious cultural shift in transfer awareness as evidenced by the students' expression of their desire to transfer to institutions such as UCLA and Berkeley.

The College provides a robust array of support services on the main campus; however, services at the South Gate Educational Center (SGEC) and Distance Education are limited. The quality and level of service for distance learners and SGEC are not comparable to the main campus. Students expressed concern to the team members that many services are inadequate and do not meet their needs. The College has expanded hours for services on the main campus to include more evening and Saturday hours, however, in order to fully meet the needs expressed by the students, the College should consider developing a comprehensive plan that will address the overall needs of all students including evening, re-entry and SGEC students (II.C.1, ER 15; II.C.2).

For distance education students, a class titled "How to Succeed in an Online Course" is offered, covering the basic navigation of the online environment including how to post to forums, take quizzes, submit assignments, and other common online skills. Additionally, a pre-assessment quiz is available online for students to self-assess their readiness to take an online course. Video modules are available and include various topics to help prepare a student to be successful in their online class. Students are not required to complete the pre-assessment tools, however, since success and retention rates for students enrolling in online/hybrid course are lower than face-to-face courses, the students may benefit from a mandatory requirement of these support mechanisms.

Examples of the services offered to online students are free online Writing Lab and Tutorial services, Counseling Online Quick Question service and E-chat with a Counselor, and the ability to purchase books online from the Bookstore, obtain library materials and conduct Admissions and Records transactions online. Students can make appointments with counselors either face-to-face, telephone or over the internet. Students are able to speak with counselors over the telephone or internet but they are not able to obtain educational plans in any other modality except from face-to-face interaction in the Counseling Center. Also, assessment testing only occurs on campus and at SGEC. The college does offer an online orientation to students and currently 3,453 students have completed the orientation since July 1, 2015. The counseling department also created YouTube informational videos for students. Seven videos were developed to help students navigate the matriculation process.

At SGEC, Admissions and Records has one classified staff available for each of the A and B shifts. If a student needs services that the staff member cannot complete, the paperwork is transfer to the main campus for processing. The same is true for the financial aid department. Since there is no direct supervision of these departments at SGEC, the SGEC Dean provides

daily guidance and attempts to assist the students as much as possible. Counseling and transfer services appeared adequate to meet the needs of the students. There are two full-time and six adjunct counselors available. Assessment is available five days a week. DSPS services are offered in limited capacity, and Fiscal services are available M/Th from 11a-7 PM and T/W 4-7 PM.

Support services not available at SGEC include EOPS/CARE, Foster Youth, Veterans, and Mental Health Counseling. No food service is available. Students expressed concern that the bookstore was only open from 11am to 4 pm, which is not convenient when they need to buy scantrons and other school supplies before or after class. There are Bookstore hours for the South Gate Educational Center on the ELAC website listed as 11a-7:15 PM, however those hours are not found in the printed catalog or spring 2016 class schedule. A writing center is available and the math lab is located in the library, but the learning assistance center is no longer housed at SGEC. Recently the Student Center has been converted to a classroom and students have little space other than the library to study. Students were seen studying in the hallways. Students and staff also expressed concern for the cleanliness and safety of the building. Many students need to park a block from campus, which can be unsafe walking at night. The College does provide a shuttle service from SGEC to the main campus, as many students are enrolled in classes at both locations (II.C.3; ER 15)

ELAC's co-curricular and athletics programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience. The College has an Associated Student Union (ASU) and Inter Club Council that is student driven and appears to help students become involved in co-curricular programs. Students involved in the ASU must meet the District standards to participate. The ASU provides several opportunities for students to provide feedback to the ASU either through the Inter Club Council or the open forums that are held each year. The ASU also runs a book rental program. The Inter Club Council currently has 70 chartered clubs. Each club is eligible for a \$1000 transfer stipend to visit a four-year university. The funds request forms are very thorough and are well documented. Each form goes through a two-step approval process and funds are available once receipts are presented for approved expenditures. Various clubs have attended several conferences and competitions including the Engineering Club attending a competition in Canada and coming away with a second place award; and the Respiratory Care Program attending a conference in Florida and visiting a four-year institution while there. The students unanimously feel supported by the faculty and administration.

The district provides parliamentary training to the new leadership each year with all nine colleges in attendance. Also, during the current academic year, the ICC now includes a faculty advisor. The current advisor has already started training with club advisors and it has been well received by the students. The ASU also supports campus-wide events such as Mexican Independence Day and Chinese New Year. Students attended the Men of Color Conference and also host the Transfer Student Conference.

The College offers seven men's sports and nine women's sports and the Athletics Department is student-athlete focused. Student athletes meet with one of two designated student-athlete academic counselors.

The Athletics Department holds the student-athletes to several goals within the program; these include citizenship, class attendance, ELAC Training rules, information, and discipline policy. The college co-curricular program and activities are very well aligned with its mission and vision and appear very appropriate to the institution. Recently the East Los Angeles College Athletic Department has placed a “Huskies Athletic Recruit Form” on the institution’s main web page. A “drop down” bar appears on the main page for “Athletics” where a potential student-athlete has the ability to write in a sport or sports they would like to see the college adopt. Prior to this, the Athletic department took a poll of incoming freshman asking for them to submit the name or names of a sport they would like to see ELAC adopt. As a result of this “poll”, the ELAC Athletic Department added an intercollegiate women’s swim team. Results of surveys and polls are shared with coaches within the Athletics Department, the supervising Dean, Vice Presidents and the College President. The College President makes the final decision as to any addition or subtraction of sports offered at the college (II.C.4).

The College provides counseling and academic advising programs to support student development and success. The program orients students to understand the academic requirements and information about graduation and transfer. In addition to general counseling, the College offers, counseling services in EOPS, International students, DSPS, Noncredit, CalWORKS, Athletics, Puente, Adelante, First Year Completion, MESA, and Veterans. Additionally, students have access to a Transfer Center and Career and Job Services Center. The Career and Job Services Department is available for students to take a series of online career assessments to help students who are undecided on various fields of study. The online assessments include the Strong Interest Inventory and Eureka. Students have access to a jobs database in which they can search for job exclusive for ELAC students.

In 2014, the College President created a Task Force on Transfer since the College recognized that they needed to increase the number of students transferring to other institutions. The task force developed activities to increase campus and community engagement. The Transfer Center holds numerous sessions including Transfer 101 and sessions for Student Parents. Also a number of university representatives are present on the campus during the semester to answer students’ questions regarding transfer. The Transfer Center sponsors tours to colleges such as Loyola Marymount, UC San Barbara, UCLA and UC San Diego. After the first Transfer Summit, the Transfer Center conducted a survey and the results were very positive overall. 132 participants completed the survey and 83.9% of the participants were satisfied with the event and would attend again.

The college holds A+O+C Days for high school seniors to participate at ELAC or the South Gate Educational Center. Students are able to participate in the English and math assessment, complete the new student orientation and meet a counselor. The college holds the event in February and March to help students complete the requirements needed to obtain priority registration requirements. The high schools provide transportation to the college and then the college provides the various sessions necessary to complete the requirements. The college is reaching out to student through concurrent enrollment in K-12. The GO East L.A. – greater outcomes for East L.A. is a partnership between ELAC, the L.A. unified school district, Garfield HS, and Cal State Univ. L.A. The goal is to create a college and career pathway for students by increasing awareness, preparation, retention, completion and transfers. The

program provides parent conferences for middle and high school student parents to learn about financial aid, the economic benefits of a college education and dispelling myths and barriers that often get in the way of students going to college. The College has several learning communities that serve students in a cohort model. The Adelante First Year Experience Program began in 2006 as a comprehensive program that seeks to improve student preparation, retention and transfer through collaboration among instructors, student-tutors, counselors, and Adelante staff. The Adelante Program brings together student services, a stimulating learning environment, and committed faculty, which together provide all Adelante first year students with the very best opportunity to success in their higher level courses.

The John Delloro Transfer Program is designed to provide student with a strong foundation of skills to succeed both in academics and in the community. The program offers a unique combination of coursework, close student-faculty interactions, peer-mentorship and ongoing workshops and events centered on social justice. The two-year learning community is designed for students who plan to transfer to a 4-year university. The learning community provides guaranteed enrollment in all program courses. Students receive personal attention from all program faculty. Successful completion of the program ensures transfer readiness and transfer competitiveness in 2 years.

Counseling faculty remain current on various degrees, certificates, and transfer through regularly scheduled meetings and training within the department. Counseling faculty use the General Catalog and Catalog Update, along with four-year university transfer requirements when advising students on completion of their degree, certificate and transfer goal. Counseling faculty along with academic discipline faculty provide workshops to discuss different career pathways associated with degrees and certificates within various disciplines (II.C.5).

Like all California Community Colleges, ELAC is an open access college and adheres to the California State Regulations. High school students are able to attend with proper consent and approval. The College adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission. The College advises student on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificates, and transfer.

The District has admissions policies consistent with its mission and state regulations. These policies include special admission of part- and full-time K-12 students, F-1 students, noncitizens, and persons who do not possess a high school diploma or equivalent. The colleges all adhere to these policies when admitting students. These policies are published in catalogs and class schedules, as well as available on websites. The colleges also have developed and adhere to admission criteria for specific academic programs such as nursing and radiologic technology. These criteria are published on departmental websites as well as college catalogs.

All the colleges advise students on the pathways to complete degrees, certificates and transfer goals in various ways. While all the colleges rely primarily on counselors to advise students on these pathways, other resources are relied upon, including transfer and career centers and a number of support services and programs such as First Year Experience, Honors, Puente, and MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement). (Standard II.C.6, ER 16)

The College has an assessment laboratory of 48 computers and is open each day and every Saturday for testing. Students are encouraged to complete practice exams and activities that are found on the website prior to the assessment exam. ELAC utilizes the College Board Accuplacer computerized assessment instrument for English, Reading, Mathematics, and English-as-Second Language and Noncredit course placements. The college has moved to Accuplacer since Compass will no longer be available. West Los Angeles College is currently piloting the California Common Assessment and the College hopes the infrastructure for the assessment platform will be complete sometime in fall 2016. The college accepts assessment results from all California community colleges. Administration indicated that the validity and disproportionate impact studies for the current assessment instrument were complete, but they were not provided to the team to review (II.C.7).

The Los Angeles Community College District has policies in place for the maintenance and destruction of confidential student records in accordance with state and federal law. The colleges do not use social security numbers (SSN) as the key to records; students are assigned student identification numbers. Electronic records are stored securely in the District student information system, and files are routinely backed up and stored off site. Access to confidential student records by employees is controlled through security where users are assigned passwords based upon their job classification and approval of their supervisor. The District general counsel provides workshops on the confidentiality, security, and maintenance of student records for admissions and records staff. Students can access their electronic records online. Access to student records in person requires a picture identification from the student.

Various paper records are maintained on the campuses in locked files, with access controlled by the supervisor of that office. Some paper records are scanned (imaged) into an online database (product varies by college) and stored on a protected server. The information on the servers is backed up locally and is the responsibility of the college. The student health centers comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) and maintain records in an electronic records system via a contracted service.

The District has a policy for classification of records in accordance with state law as well as destruction of student records based upon the classification system. The colleges publish and follow policies for release of confidential student records that align with current federal and state law. The security and maintenance of student records is a shared responsibility between the District and colleges, with the District having primary responsibility for the records in the Student Information System. (II.C.8)

Conclusion

The College meets the standard, except for Standards and Eligibility Requirement as follows:

College Recommendation 5 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the College must assess and implement a plan at its South Gate Educational Center to provide appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable student and learning support services to students. Additionally, the team recommends the institution has a sufficient

number of staff to support the educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the South Gate Educational Center. (II.B.1, ER 17; II.C.1; II.C.2, II.C.3; ER 15)

Standard III - Resources

Standard III.A Human Resources

General Observations

The human resources function at Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) includes both a Human Resource (HR) Division and a Personnel Commission (PC). While both entities are co-located in the District's Educational Services Center (ESC) office building, the authorities and functions are separate. These two entities provide comprehensive human resource services in support of LACCD's employment practices and in adherence to adopted hiring policies to meet the instructional and support needs of the colleges and District.

LACCD's classified staff employment processes are administered by the PC, an autonomously governed merit system organization. The PC is responsible for recruitment and testing for classified staff and management vacancies, audit of assignments, and classification for support staff. The PC also acts as the hearing panel in disciplinary hearing matters affecting classified employees.

The HR Division has oversight for employment operations, employee relations, and professional development activities for faculty, management, and classified employees. The hiring of tenure-track faculty and management personnel is overseen by District Office HR personnel. The hiring process for adjunct faculty is decentralized to the individual colleges, with final qualification and eligibility determinations made by the HR Division.

Faculty and administrators are hired at East Los Angeles College using the state minimum qualifications criteria set by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors as well as the LACCD and ELAC hiring policies and procedures. Tenure-track faculty hiring follows the district Human Resources Guide R-120.

All educational programs and services are managed by administrators or faculty on reassigned time. The qualifications for these managers follow the state minimum qualification criteria set by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors.

Findings and Evidence

The LACCD Board of Trustees, in its role as the governing authority, establishes policies pertaining to the faculty, staff, and administrators employed by the District. These policies, procedures, and related supporting documentation are found on the District's website. The District's HR Division and PC are responsible for the oversight in the hiring of qualified personnel to serve its nine colleges and central District support services, including the selection, evaluation, and monitoring processes within the LACCD. District guidelines provide consistency in the development, definition, and establishment of hiring policies and processes for administrators, full-time faculty, and classified staff. Job descriptions for full-time/regular positions reflect the duties, responsibilities, and authority in support of mission and goals for the college and the District.

Due to the dynamic staffing needs encountered at the college level, decentralization of the recruitment and selection process for part-time/adjunct faculty was implemented. The District's HR department verifies the qualifications of recommended part-time/adjunct faculty prior to hire. HR R-130, entitled "Adjunct Faculty Selection and Pay," requires the president and Academic Senate at each college to develop written procedures governing the search and selection of adjunct faculty to ensure that a thorough and deliberate search for the most qualified candidate is conducted well in advance of the starting date of the assignment. Procedures and processes for the selection of part-time/adjunct faculty are not clearly and publicly stated. College-level adjunct hiring processes result in inconsistent notification and advertisement of employment opportunities. HR reviews part-time/adjunct qualifications upon receipt of candidates from the colleges. Candidates' qualifications are evaluated and verified as meeting the job description requirements.

At ELAC, replacement and growth requests for full-time faculty are made through each unit's Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plan (AUP). The needs identified in the PRSE and AUP are then prioritized utilizing a rubric through the Academic Senate Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC), which has representation from faculty and administrators. The Academic Senate reviews and discusses the hiring priority list. The HPC co-chairs are urged to be present during the Senate review meeting. A Senate-approved list is then forwarded to the college president. The president reviews the list to determine which faculty positions to fill and notifies the Academic Senate president (with a copy to the HPC co-chairs, AFT president, and participating department chairs) of this decision prior to the week of final exams. If the president deviates from the Senate's recommended prioritization, he or she provides an explanation in writing to the Academic Senate president. Hiring committees represent the faculty within the respective department. College selection committees for faculty include faculty with subject area expertise and administrators. Administrator selection committees include administrators with expertise in supervising area(s), an appropriate number of faculty and staff, and the supervising vice president. (III.A.1)

Faculty qualifications are clearly stated on job descriptions, including education, skills, experience, and/or certifications. Job descriptions include professional responsibilities beyond teaching expectations. Student learning outcomes, curriculum development, and college-level committee requirements are included in responsibility expectations when developing full-time faculty job descriptions. HR reviews the draft job descriptions for competencies, compliance and consistency. Faculty candidates are required to meet all published job qualifications. A faculty-led process for determining equivalency for stated qualifications exists, but is generally limited in utilization. Faculty performance evaluations include the assessment of multiple measures of these job-related requirements.

ELAC faculty job announcements often require professional experience beyond the applicable degree, discipline expertise, and teaching skills at the postsecondary level beyond teaching assistantship. ELAC faculty job announcements also include expected scholarly or professional activities, experience with curriculum development, and experience working with Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment as "desired qualifications." All faculty positions require a teaching demonstration component. Some faculty and all administrator

positions require a writing component. The college hiring committees define which elements to utilize in order to evaluate effective teaching in their hiring processes. The two most commonly utilized methods were teaching demos and writing samples. (III.A.2, ER14)

Job descriptions for administrators and other positions supporting institutional effectiveness and academic quality include requisite education and experience requirements. Job descriptions are updated by HR and the PC to include evolving institutional responsibilities. HR and PC personnel verify candidate qualifications prior to employment consideration. The district verifies the qualifications of candidates recommended for academic hire by evaluating the original transcripts (degree award and coursework completed) and, if required, by auditing appraisal of an original verification of employment letter with a follow-up to the issuing entity if additional clarification is required. In the case of positions requiring a license or certificate, evaluators contact the licensing agency to verify and document the license/certification. Academic personnel are not considered hired until such time as minimum qualifications clearance is completed.

Faculty equivalency is the purview of the District Academic Senate. The Equivalency Committee is composed of the college Academic Senate Presidents, or their designated representatives, and chaired by the DAS 1st Vice President. The committee is responsible for evaluating all petitions for equivalency to minimum qualifications, and for maintaining discipline committee membership lists, accredited colleges / universities lists and alternate titles for disciplines. Candidates denied minimum qualifications clearance must provide an applicant, accompanied by original transcripts and, if required to satisfy professional experience requirements, original verification of experience letters from former employers. The candidate's paperwork must speak for itself, establishing during review by two academic equivalency committees that the candidate is in fact qualified to teach all of the coursework the discipline in the LACCD. (III.A.3)

LACCD has established policies and procedures regarding the evaluation of educational degrees earned by faculty, administrators, and support personnel. Applicants and employees seeking promotional opportunities are required to submit official transcripts from accredited institutions. Degrees earned from non-U.S. institutions are required to be evaluated by an established state-recognized evaluation organization for equivalency. Finalists for all positions must submit official sealed transcripts at the final interview. These transcripts are reviewed by the District Human Resource Department to verify that the degrees are appropriate and are from accredited U.S. institutions. The Office of Diversity houses EEO/Compliance officers, whose role is to provide EEO training to individual college staff designated as college EEO representatives and selection committee members. This training ensures that each college has designated EEO representatives to participate in all phases of the recruitment, interview and selection process, as well as ensuring that selection committee members are versed in EEO standards. (III.A.4)

The District has established a system of performance evaluation for faculty, staff, and administrative personnel. The evaluation process is dictated by individual collective bargaining agreements and District policy. Faculty evaluation tracking is delegated to individual colleges. The PC distributes evaluation notices to classified employees and their

respective supervisor during the employee's probationary period. Thereafter, HR uses an automated system to notify supervisors of upcoming and past-due performance evaluations. Current District wide completion rates average approximately 50 percent. (Standard III.A.5).

Probationary faculty are evaluated under the negotiated evaluation structure. The description of the evaluation process is found in Article 19 (AFT 1521 Contract, 67-76) and Article 42 (AFT 1521 Contract, 156-164) of the AFT 1521 contract. The forms and timeline for the Tenure-track evaluation are found in Appendix C, Section 2 of the AFT 1521 contract (185-188). Probationary faculty are comprehensively evaluated every year for the four years of the tenure process. All tenured faculty members are regularly evaluated through a less comprehensive process called the "basic evaluation." This process alternates on a three-year cycle with the comprehensive evaluation. Adjunct faculty are evaluated using the basic evaluation. All evaluations usually rotate on a three-year cycle. The basic evaluation reviews the same qualities and uses the same comprehensive evaluation forms. It may include student surveys but does not require a committee. (III.A.5)

The evaluation rubrics include separate criteria for Classroom faculty, Counselors, Librarians, ISA/Consulting Instructors, Nurses, Disabilities Specialist/Instructors, and Child Development Center Instructor (AFT 1521 Contract, 189-197. There is a separate process by which administrators may perform a special review of faculty which allows for a direct method for administration to address evaluation issues with faculty. (AFT 1521 Contract, 198-206). (III.A.5)

Performance evaluations for non-faculty positions use guidelines and forms as found in each unit's collective bargaining agreement when applicable. These include:

- Classified staff, AFT College Guild: Performance Evaluation for Permanent Classified Employees
- Classified staff, Local 99: Performance Evaluation for Classified Employees
- Classified staff, Building Trades: Performance Evaluation Form
- Classified staff, Confidential: Performance Evaluation for Confidential Employees
- Classified staff, Management: Administrative Performance Appraisal
- Academic staff, Administrators: LACCD Administrator's Performance Evaluation
- Academic staff, Administrators: Unrepresented Performance Evaluation
- College vice presidents: Performance Evaluation Process for College Vice Presidents

A review of bargaining unit contracts and forms available on the LACCD district HR website, interviews with department chairs, and interviews with deans provided evidence that the institution has processes and procedures in place to assure the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The bargaining unit contracts contain written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. (III.A.5)

Within the faculty evaluation process under section A. Professional Qualities: Professional Contributions item nine is “Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (for classroom faculty, includes approves SLO’s on class syllabi.)”

Standard II.A.16 speaks to the institution’s evaluation, quality improvement, and currency in all instructional programs. This generates a programmatic discussion in the faculty regarding improving the learning conditions for students. Within the faculty review process (contained within the AFT 1521 Contract, Article 19) Article 19.G. contains a list of the responsibilities for the *Basic Evaluations of Tenures and Temporary Faculty*:

The person responsible for completing the evaluation summary will indicate the rating of a faculty member’s performance. If the overall rating is a “needs to improve” or “unsatisfactory,” the evaluator shall prepare a written improvement plan which should include appropriate professional growth activities to address those specific issues. (Article 19.G.6) Article 19.H. contains the protocols for the *Comprehensive Evaluations of Tenured and Temporary Faculty*. This process involves more data collection than the *Basic Evaluations* and will also culminate in written recommendations and an improvement plan for the faculty member being reviewed if they receive any “needs improvement” ratings through in any of the review rubrics (AFT 1521, Appendix C).

East Los Angeles College follows the contractually mandated evaluation process that requires faculty participation in the SLO assessment process, including the use of assessment results to improve teaching and learning. Through interviews with department chairs and division deans the team found ample evidence that the review procedures for faculty are meaningful and provide faculty the opportunity for introspection about their craft, teaching methodologies, and SLO assessment. (III.A.6)

Faculty evaluations include the assessment of learning outcomes. The negotiated evaluation process and related forms include requirements for the utilization of learning outcomes in the improvement of teaching and learning. Academic administrators’ evaluations do not include the assessment of responsibilities related to learning outcomes. (III.A.6).

The staffing levels are established through the district maintaining compliance with regulations such as the recommended 75/25 fulltime to part time ratios mandated by AB1725 and minimum faculty levels required by the State Chancellor’s office. Hiring decisions are made using information provided in the departments/unit’s Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plan (AUP). Additionally, the AFT contract lists guidelines for replacement and new faculty positions that include the Educational Master Plan, program needs, and program viability among other criteria. (III.A.7)

LACCD employs a substantial cadre of over 3,300 part-time/adjunct faculty among the nine colleges and academic organizations. Each college is delegated the responsibility for orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development of adjunct faculty at their respective campus. Opportunities for part-time faculty participation in the teaching and learning aspects of college operations and decision-making are provided and encouraged. (Standard III.A.8).

Part-time and adjunct faculty receive orientation, oversight, and evaluation directly from the department chair. The AFT contract, Article 19.E.1 states, “Temporary adjunct faculty shall receive a basic evaluation before the end of their second semester of employment and at least

once every six semesters of employment thereafter.” The ELAC Faculty Handbook provides information on policies and procedures, college services, professional development, and other personnel related information. The Professional Development Office has also produced a document called the New Faculty Survival Guide to help new faculty get to know the campus. (III.A.8)

ELAC employs approximately 305 classified employees. The District Personnel Commission ensures that staff that are hired possess the necessary qualifications to perform their duties. The *Request for Non-Faculty Positions Informational Worksheet*, contained on page 12 of the Annual Update Plan, provides an opportunity for programs to request new classified staffing through linking their assessment of outcomes in the program and an analysis of the data provided by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness to demonstrate the need for new staff. Staffing prioritization is then considered by the Human Resources Committee which is composed of college staff, non-voting faculty, and non-voting administrators. This new committee is in its first cycle of prioritizing staffing requests and sent its recommendations to the Shared Governance Council for the first time on February 8th, 2016. The Shared Governance Council then forwards this list to the college president and his cabinet for review and to make a final determination. (III.A.9)

The college currently employs a president, three vice-presidents, three associate vice-presidents, sixteen deans and associate deans, and seven classified managers. Staffing requests are identified through Cluster Update Plans. A review of Cluster reports provided evidence that this process is where new administrative positions are proposed. The requests generated from the Cluster Reports are then collated and go to the President’s Cabinet to be prioritized. (III.A.10) Written personnel policies and procedures are available online for information and review. A process of regular policy review and updating has been established. The Human Resource Council meets monthly to review and recommend proposed changes in Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. The HR Council’s membership includes college presidents, the vice chancellor of HR, college vice presidents (academic affairs, student services, and administrative services), and resource personnel, as needed. The PC regularly reviews its policies and procedures regarding the employment of classified staff. These rules and regulations provide fair and equitable employment conditions. The Employment Relations Department is responsible for addressing allegations of inconsistent application of District policies.

A review of the written policies and procedures for all positions posted on their District’s website has validated the existence of distinct written procedures for hiring of all personnel. The College works in concert with the District Office of Human Resources and the District Personnel Commission to ensure adherence to the California Education Code. All personnel policies and regulations are posted online as are all collective bargaining agreements. Detailed information is provided for the evaluation of all respective employee groups. (Standard III.A.11).

The District Human Resources Division provides leadership in establishing an equitable administration of rules and policies in accordance with Human Resource Guides, Personnel Guides, union contracts, Board Rules, and state Education Code. The District provides a link to all employee Collective Bargaining Agreements on its webpage. The District Office for

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion ensures that policies are equitably administered. Personnel policies and procedures are publicized, and are accessible. (III.A.11)

A review of ELAC's website, calendar of events, provided ample evidence that ELAC and the LACCD provide a variety of programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel with celebrations of diversity as well as various training opportunities. (III.A.12)

The Office of Diversity Programs provides programs, analysis, and training to support the District's diverse personnel. This office is assigned compliance and investigatory responsibilities to resolve allegations of unlawful discrimination and conduct. LACCD's "Project Match" program provides a formalized outreach program to aspiring, but historically underrepresented individuals to encourage community college faculty careers. An Equal Employment Opportunity Plan has been adopted and includes an annual evaluation of employment equity and diversity of LACCD's employees. (Standard III.A.12).

The LACCD Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion collects ethnicity data for all new employees, including academic, classified, and unclassified personnel. A review of the 2015 *Equal Employment Opportunity Plan* and other documents on the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion website provided evidence that the district and the institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission. (III.A.12)

LACCD Board Rule 1204 contains the district's Code of Ethics statement. The LACCD District Academic Senate has adopted an ethics statement based upon the 1987 American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics and ELAC's Academic Senate adopted an additional statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibilities. All other personnel are covered by the District Board Rule. (III.A.13)

ELAC plans and provides for Professional development opportunities for its personnel through a variety of committees and centers including the Academic Senate Professional Development Advisory committee, Conference/Tuition Committee, the Teaching and Learning Center. A review of the Academic Senate Professional Development Advisory committee website, minutes from their meetings, and their current calendar of events being offered provided evidence of a wide variety of instructional professional development opportunities. There does not seem to be as much of a structure to provide professional development programming for classified staff as the Academic Senate Professional Development Advisory committee has a faculty focus. A review of the Conference/Tuition Committee grants that were provided in a spreadsheet of the individual conferences granted for 2015-16 show that the vast majority of the funds went to faculty and administrators. There is a mention of a Staff Development committee in the self-study, but the team was unable to find any record of professional development provided through this committee for classified staff. (III.A.14)

The District has long-established professional development programs. Existing programs and new opportunities for District employees are continually identified, evaluated, and developed, i.e., "Dean's Academy," "Professional Development College," and "The President's Academy." The introduction of a partnership with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) to create the "President's Academy" provides relevant training for

aspiring LACCD executive leaders. The District Academic Senate provides faculty representatives the ability to work collaboratively in providing content in support of student learning and success. The District also explores methods to increase opportunities for its classified staff. Campus-level trainings are provided by District personnel as part of the regular communication and educational support. (III.A.14).

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

The District provides security and has established both physical and electronic access safeguards in the confidentiality of personnel and employment records. Access to confidential electronic personnel data is monitored and limited to authorized employees. Procedures, as evidenced by Administrative Regulation C-10, Custodian of District Records, and collective bargaining agreement language are in place to provide employee access to his/her personnel records. (III.A.15).

Conclusions

The College has robust professional development opportunities available to faculty; however the team could not find evidence of the same support for classified staff.

The LACCD provides comprehensive human resource services to employ qualified personnel in support of its broad educational programs. The District has established policies and procedures beginning with the recruitment process, hiring, evaluation, and employee-related matters throughout employment for its regular employees.

Although the colleges currently are responsible for the adjunct faculty hiring process, the District is responsible to assure that employment policies and practices are clearly described and equitably administered. However, the recruitment and employment of adjunct faculty is unevenly administered, and, therefore, the District does not meet Standard III.A.1.

The District does not conduct regular evaluations of all staff, and does not meet Standard III.A.5.

Faculty evaluations include an assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as a component of the performance appraisal; however, academic administrators' evaluations do not have an SLO responsibility component, so the District does not meet Standard III.A.6. The team commends the District for its commitment to professional development and improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of its employees in support of student achievement.

College Recommendation 6 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness the team

recommends that the institution establish a regular and systematic evaluation of its professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement. Additionally, the team recommends assessing the current distribution of professional development resources and opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators. (III.A.14)

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

District Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District ensure all personnel are systematically evaluated at stated intervals in accordance with the bargaining agreements and Board policies. (Standard III.A.5).

District Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District update the performance evaluations of academic administrators to include the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. (Standard III.A.6).

Standard III.B Physical Resources

General Observations

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

East Los Angeles College has a student body of over 35,000 students. The college has gone through a constant building of new facilities and it has transformed the college. Buildings have been designed to meet the needs of the students. The college uses several documents to guide the planning, acquiring or building, maintaining and upgrading or replacing its physical resources. These documents include the Strategic Master Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and the Facilities Master Plan.

The college utilizes the funding sources appropriately including the Propositions A, AA, and Measure J initiatives and the Budget Committee is the central body through which college budget decisions are discussed and recommendations made to the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC). Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals.

Findings and Evidence

The District plays a significant role in ensuring that all locations under its purview are safe and that sufficient resources are provided to maintain each facility. The LACCD contracts with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department for college campus security. This agreement provides for a standardized and coordinated approach to campus safety. Further, a report titled Blue Ribbon Panel on Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness was adopted December 16, 2015. The charge of the panel was to, "review the District's existing policies and procedures on safety and security in order to determine the readiness of the colleges, District satellites and the Educational Service Center in cases of natural catastrophes or criminal events." It will be critical to follow up on the progress of the colleges and District in their response to the recommendations and implementation of plans. The sufficiency of physical resources at the colleges is clearly assured by the District. Three bond issues have been passed since 2001 resulting in nearly \$6.2 billion in capital project funding. To date, about 80 percent of those funds have been expended. All funds are budgeted to projects. Sufficiency is also evident by the current cap load status. District wide, the lecture capacity/load ratio is 162 percent while the laboratory cap/load is at 144 percent. The District has supported the colleges in assuring access. ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) transition plans were created for the nine colleges using District resources. The

implementation of the plan is funded by a District wide bond allocation of almost \$69 million.

The College assures safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs and learning support. The College has a Maintenance and Operations staff and follows ADA Compliance requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Fair Employment & Housing Act, Government Code Section 11135, and other applicable codes. The college does not discriminate on the basis of disability or other protected classes. (III.B.1)

The college currently has four sites it maintains including the main campus, an approximately 50,000 square foot Corporate Center which houses the Foundation Office, distance education, research, specially funded grant management and payroll. The college also maintains the currently leased facility, South Gate Educational Center, and the Firestone Property which is the future site of the bond funded South Gate Educational Center. (III.B.1)

The district, using bond resources, worked with the nine colleges and developed an ADA transition plan for each. These plans are located at the district and at each college. Plans were reviewed as evidence and determined to be adequate. (III.B.1)

When new projects are built or when buildings are renovated the Division of the State Architect (DSA) performs an ADA compliance review of that project for compliance with current codes. The transition plans cover those problems outside of project scope, for example, buildings not currently slated for renovation, site access issues, campus signage, etc. The Master Building Program Budget Plan, adopted October 2011, allocated \$68,978,869 under district-wide initiatives for ADA Compliance. (III.B.1)

The College uses the Program Review Plan, the Facilities Master Plan and the Five Year Construction Plan to determine the needs for facilities as well as equipment needs and where equipment is needed for distance education. The College uses a database called FUSION to provide evidence of efficiency percentages for building and space and capacity load ratios. The college uses the Work Environment Committee to ensure that upgrades and replacement to physical as well as a technological infrastructure take place to support the needs of the College. Several construction projects are currently or have been completed in the last several years. The college has transformed and outdate buildings have been replaced or renovated. (III.B.1)

The College contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department for all law enforcement services. The College employs a variety of personal for the safety and security for the College which includes a sergeant, a team leader, a campus deputy, and 14 armed security officers. The Sheriff's Department provides 24-hour, seven-day-a-week security coverage for the campus and the off-site facilities. The college compiles an Annual Security Report that outlines safety and security practices for the campus and is available to the campus. (III.B.1)

The District provides effective centralized services for planning, acquiring, building, maintaining and upgrading its physical resources. Following the 17 recommendations in the Independent Review Panel Report, the District has developed a new program management approach assuring the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services to achieve its mission. Noting that shared governance practices had significantly contributed to increased costs, changes, delays, and disruptions to the Building Program, the Board responded with BT4: Resolution-Standardize Centralized Accountability Controls dated September 12, 2012. The resolution centralized accountability measures and established that college project manager's report through the program manager to the District. The District uses a "project allocation model" in dispensing bond funds which ensures that the Board of Trustees has primary control over which projects will be built at the colleges and that projects will align with District priorities, i.e., support of the Educational Master Plan ensuring a consistency of intent. To ensure the model is followed, Board Resolution to Adopt a Master Budget Plan and to Implement Policies to Strengthen Oversight and Spending Practices for the District's Construction Program (BT6) was approved by the Board on October 5, 2011.

The college maintains a Facilities Master Plan to access its needs for acquiring, building, maintaining, upgrading, and replacing its physical resources. The college uses the Annual Unit Plans, Program Review Plans, and Annual Cluster Plans to help determine the needs for facilities. The college has several construction projects funded through Propositions A, AA, and Measure J bonds. (III.B.2)

The College also has a strategic plan that addresses the facilities needs of the campus. Each department completes Program Review and Annual Unit Plans to request equipment and Annual Cluster Plans requests for the status of space and buildings. This information is used to determine equipment needs. Information is included in the various plans to address distance education purposes. (III.B.2)

The college evaluates the effectiveness of its physical resources by utilizing the facility reports in the FUSION database. The FUSION data is used to develop the District's Five Year Construction Plan that is submitted annually to the California Community College Chancellor's Office. Within the various plans distance education needs are addressed. The college has used the 50,000 square foot space at the Corporate Center which some distance education faculty are located with equipment that is needed for the distance education. (III.B.2)

The District materially assists the colleges in updating master facilities plans on a regular basis. This planning is managed through the bond program manager reporting to the District Office. The BuildLACCD website shows evidence that all nine colleges have current facility master plans, the oldest being less than eight years old. Further, the District assists the colleges in facility condition assessment and uses the data to identify needs and allocate District-scheduled maintenance funds.

The College relies on data from the Facilities Utilization and Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) annual reports to assess the effective utilization of space. In addition to FUSION,

the College utilizes the integrated planning process to align facilities with the ESMP. Data is evaluated from the campus climate surveys, student surveys, the College Administrative Services survey, and the CMMS (maintenance work order system) to improve facilities. Campus climate surveys are utilized to assess campus safety and to improve the healthful learning and working environment. The institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis. The college has a Shared Governance Council (ESGC) where the Budget Committee discusses and makes recommendations to the Council. (III.B.3)

Through the Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC) the committee is primarily responsible for developing the policies and structure related to comprehensive program review, annual updates, and program viability. The PRVC meets on a monthly basis to develop and oversee the implementation of the program review, annual update, and viability processes for all campus departments or units and programs. Program review and Annual Update plans are updated yearly. (III.B.3).

The Work Environment Committee recommends policies and monitors all work on environmental matters and is a required committee as specified in Articles 9 and 32 of the College Faculty Guild Agreement. (III.B.3). The results of the plans are used to effectively plan to improve facilities and equipment for various programs. The process appears to be timely and efficient.

The Board of Trustees adopted the Master Building Program Budget Plan per resolution BT6 dated October 5, 2011. The plan assigns budgets at the individual project level providing support for long-range capital plans. The Board adopted Resolution 3 of BT6 dated October 5, 2011, stating, "The chancellor ... will include in the regular budget reports the identification of funding measures to address the costs of maintaining and operating expanded facilities." Following that, the District produced the Comprehensive Plan for Total Cost of Ownership detailing seven points defining, "a process for establishing the true cost of additional space." The Board voted to create a Deferred Maintenance Fund by passing Board Resolution BT2 on May 23, 2012. This resolution sets aside a fixed amount each year from the General Fund to address postponed and emergency repairs and maintenance work not funded by the bond program. In addition, the District provides funding to the colleges for maintenance and operations calculated by a formula that takes into consideration total assignable square footage as a part of the basic allocation. (Standard III.B.4).

At ELAC, the Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan are the plans that guide facility and long range capital development. The Master Facility Plans address long-term, often 20-25 year building and infrastructure needs that require significantly more funds than an individual or the aggregate of all bond issues bond issues provide. As a result, a budgeting and prioritization process was conducted to determine the list of projects and the total amount anticipated for each bond issue. Upon passage of the bonds and availability of funds, the projects are executed. (III.B.4).

The Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC) which is a part of the Strategic Planning Committee creates the Facilities Master Plan. The subcommittee is made up of college faculty, administrators, staff, and students. The Facilities Master Plan serves as the college's

guiding strategy on facilities issues and seeks to fulfill the College Mission and Strategic Goals through the implementation of facilities objectives. (III.B.4)

Conclusion

In general, the role of the District in supporting the colleges to meet the Standards of Accreditation is evident and well supported. The District has implemented positive changes to the bond program management structure and adequately responded to the recommendations made in the Independent Review Panel Report.

The College meets the standard.

Standard III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) emphasizes the effective use of technology in the support of teaching and learning, student support and success, and administrative functions to assist students and staff as evidenced by the significant investment made in staff to support the use of technology, equipment and systems, and training of staff and students in the use of technology. The forty-plus members of the LACCD Information Technology department provide systems and services to support learning, assessment, and teaching with infrastructure and productivity tools as outlined in the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan-Vision 2020. Campus information technology staff at each of the nine campuses assist in the delivery of LACCD Information Technology department systems and services as well as support the classroom, computer labs, and local infrastructure to enhance the learning environment. Policy, planning, and budget recommendations regarding the use of technology across LACCD is driven by the Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC) which is a governance committee with representation from all constituents. The District Technology Committee (DTC) focuses on operational decisions and makes recommendations to the TPPC.

East Los Angeles College recognizes the importance of up-to-date technology to support teaching and learning, student access and success, and the management of daily operations. Significant emphasis is placed on training faculty, staff, and administrators in the effective use of technology through the Information Technology Department, Distance Learning Office, and Teaching and Learning Center.

The Information Technology Department services 3,400 computer systems at both the main campus and South Gate Educational Center. Technology is supported in 206 smart classrooms, 48 academic computer labs/computer classrooms, 300 wireless access points, 250 network switches, over 265 servers that assist in daily operations, as well as Libraries, Learning Assistance Centers, Writing Centers, Math Labs, and 20 departmental support labs. The Information Technology Department employs 14 staff members that provide hardware and software support to East Los Angeles College employees and students. The number of helpdesk tickets submitted to the Information Technology team in AY 15-16 was 5,043.

The College does not have a three-year replacement plan for all computers. In the October 28, 2013 ESGC minutes, a motion was amended to approve the replacement of classified employee computers in AY 13-14 but no evidence of an actual plan. A computer inventory list has been developed but there is no actual plan. There is no Total Cost of Ownership or Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan.

Departments and programs identify their technology needs through the Annual Update Plans. Technology requests are then forwarded to a larger representative body (Department Chairs, Technology Planning Subcommittee, East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council, Distance Learning Office, and Information Technology Department) to determine the technology needs for East Los Angeles College, South Gate Educational Center, and the

Corporate Center. From there, recommendations are sent to the Budget Committee for their review. The Technology Master Plan outlines the development, implementation, and evaluation of technology use across campus.

Additional updates:

The new 1,000 sq. ft. data center located at the main campus in the E3 Building will serve as the college's point of service for various systems/servers to keep the campus functioning. In addition, the college website has been updated to be mobile ready. Further updates include the installation of new networks switches in E7 Technology Building with new 1GBs switches, the installation of a new virtual environment in the Student Success computer labs, and the installation of ten new smart classrooms and upgraded four existing rooms at the South Gate Educational Center.

Findings and Evidence

Technology resources are used to support student learning, student services, and institutional effectiveness. As noted in the District/College Functional Map, this is a shared responsibility between the colleges and the District. Each college technology department provides support and infrastructure to meet campus network and computing needs. At the District level, the LACCD Information Technology department provides the wide area network infrastructure, an enterprise resource planning system for finance and human resources (SAP), a student information system (DEC/Peoplesoft), an educational planning system (DegreeWorks), email for students and staff (Office 365/Microsoft Exchange), a helpdesk ticketing system (CMMS), a scheduling system for faculty class and room assignments (Protocol ESS), an electronic curriculum development system (ECD), and other related systems as presented in the campus Self Evaluation Reports and confirmed in interviews with District and college technology staff. In addition, it was noted in interviews with campus technology managers that LACCD Information Technology assists with contract optimization, District wide technology standards, best practices, data interface to campus specific systems such as distance education systems and staff augmentations when needed to assist the colleges. (III.C.1)

East Los Angeles College Information Technology Department provides support and infrastructure to meet campus network and computing needs. At the district level, the LACCD Information Technology Department provides the wide area network infrastructure, an enterprise resource planning system for finance and human resources (SAP), a student information system (DEC/PeopleSoft), an educational planning systems (Degree Works), email for students and staff (Office 365/Microsoft Exchange), a helpdesk ticketing system (CMMS), a scheduling system for faculty class and room assignments (Protocol ESS), and an electronic curriculum development system (ECD). In addition, LACCD Information Technology assists with contract optimization, District-wide standards and best practices to assist the colleges. (III.C.1)

As stated in the Technology Master Plan, the Information Technology Department is responsible for the network infrastructure and security, academic computer labs and smart classrooms technology, wireless internet, campus/District accounts and all other technology

based services and equipment at all three sites. There are two learning management systems, Etudes and Moodle. (III.C.1)

The Technology Planning Subcommittee (stated in TPSC Self-Evaluation Report, TPSC minutes, ESCG minutes) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Technology Master Plan, which drives the College's technology planning. Technology planning, implementation, and evaluation are conducted on a six-year cycle. The Technology Master Plan directs the College's strategy on technology related issues. All plans and objectives are aligned to the College's Mission and Strategic Goals and are guided by the District Technology Plan and Vision 2020. Co-chairs of the TPSC serve on the District Technology Committee. Through program review and annual updates, departments and programs identify their technology needs. (III.C.1)

Planning at the District level is defined in the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan-Vision 2020. The plan was developed with input from all nine campuses by the District Technology Planning Taskforce (DTPT). As stated in the plan, this task force was commissioned by the TPPC and comprised faculty from each of the nine colleges, administrative leadership and students. The DTPT developed the plan as a framework for the District and identified five areas to achieve the mission, including learning, assessment, teaching, infrastructure, and productivity. The plan is reviewed regularly at TPPC meetings as evidenced by the committee minutes. In interviews with District staff, it was noted that the five-year re-assessment, due in 2016, of the current state of IT infrastructure at all the colleges and the District will be done in the next four to six months. This will be used to update the target baseline for all colleges in the technology areas identified in the LACCD Technology Strategic Plan-Vision 2020. Two of the campus technology plans indicate direct alignment with Vision 2020 and the other seven technology plans are directly aligned with their respective campus strategic plans which identify Vision 2020 as a guiding force. Further, the TPPC commissioned the Implementation Task Force (ITF) with representation from faculty, administrative leadership, represented staff, and students which developed thirty two objectives to work on for the next five years. This was approved by the TPPC in 2013. Some colleges are incorporating Total Cost of Ownership principles, but some have not. As identified in the District/College Functional Map this is a shared responsibility between the colleges and the District. (II.C.2)

The College needs to develop a three-year replacement plan for all computers and Total Cost of Ownership plan. The Information Technology Department has outgrown its current facility and there is a need to hire additional staff to address the growing needs of the College (III.C.2)

Reliable, safe, and secure technology resources are the primary responsibility of the colleges and a shared responsibility with the District. Through interviews, the team determined that the LACCD Information Technology department has developed Disaster Recover/Business Continuity plans which include local backup to disk, immediate backup to a second data center at one of the college sites about 25 kilometers away, with a final encrypted copy to tape. The tapes are moved off site to a specialized tape vault service, and the tapes are rotated out of state to Nevada for greater protection. Each campus is responsible for the security and reliability of the systems and data they support locally. All nine colleges indicate

varying levels of security for locally supported systems, with six doing local campus backup only, two having local backups at a second on-campus data center, and one college doing backup to the District. None of the colleges indicate the existence of a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan in their respective Institution Self Evaluation Reports. Interviews with campus and District technology staff confirmed that student and staff data are stored both at the District and campus servers and should be protected. (III.C.3)

The Information Technology Department maintains the College's network security through a response system called Next Generation Firewall. Other hardware systems used are Access Control Server, Virtual Private Network, and Intrusion Preventive System. A list of software and hardware purchased are located on the Systems Applications and Products site. Encryption is provided for computers on campus that store sensitive information. (III.C.3)

Support, including training, in the effective use of technology is the primary responsibility of the colleges. Each campus has the appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators for their respective systems as evidenced by the existence of various forms of teaching and learning centers on the campus as well as training opportunities. As confirmed by interviews with District and campus technology staff, training is scheduled as part of any new systems deployment. The established strategy is to create super-users for all District wide systems so that the local campus can maintain the training after initial system deployment. The District will also schedule trainings on an as-requested basis when a significant need is identified. Campus technology staff also indicates that the District Information Technology unit provides funds for off-site training in deployed technology solutions. (III.C.4)

Policies and administrative regulations in place at the District which guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning process include B-27 Network Security Policy, B-28 Use of District and College Computing Facilities, B-33 Web Accessibility Standards and Guidelines, B-34 ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan, E-89 Distance Education Policy, E-105 Student Privacy/FERPA, and E-114 Identity Theft Prevention Program. The colleges acknowledge that they abide by these policies to guide operations as evidenced in their respective Institution Self Evaluation Reports. The team confirmed in interviews that the TPPC and TPC suggest policies as needed to aid in the appropriate use of the technology. In addition, the colleges have additional local policies for campus technologies such as websites and distance education systems. (Standard III.C.4).

Security backups are done nightly using two different systems. Each protects a different subset of systems. These backups systems provide a 3-week recovery window in case of data loss or virtual server failure. All of the campus sites are virtualized and the primary backup software is Veam Backup. Veam Backup is designed specifically to backup and recover virtualized environments. It also performs application specific backup functions of Exchange, Sharepoint, and SQL servers. Currently there are 92 different virtual servers across 12 VMware hosts. (III.C.3) Netapp SAN is the central storage system for all of our major server systems, as well as user data on various network share folders. The Netapp system performs multiple snapshots throughout the day to provide instant recovery in case of file deletion or corruption, 2 days of instant recovery. Symantec Backup-Exec provides longer-term user data backup. This system uses NDMP to perform backups and restores files from the Netapp

network share folders. (III.C.4)

The Distance Learning Office and Teaching and Learning Center (Professional Development) provide technology training to administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The Distance Learning Office offers a series of professional development opportunities to include, TechFest, LMS Summit, and Online Teaching workshops. The Teaching and Learning Center offers the Microsoft Office Specialist Certificate, program information is can be found on the Professional Development website. Instructional assistants in support centers, classroom labs, and the Library assist students with computer operations and technical support when taking an online course. (III.C.4)

The College's policies and procedures guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes. All employees are expected to comply with all federal and state regulations and mandates, as well as to District policies. The list of policies are: District and College Computing Policy, Copyright Policy, Digital Media Policy, Email Policy, Computer Use Policy, Website policy, SharePoint Usage Policy, and Network Security. East Los Angeles College adheres to District Information Technology policies. (III.C.5)

Conclusions

The College meets Standards, with the exception of III.C.2. and III.C.3)

Recommendations

College Recommendation 7 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a plan that continuously plans for, updates and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services. (III.C.2)

District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District and colleges develop a comprehensive Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan to ensure reliable access, safety, and security. (Standard III.C.3).

Standard III.D Financial Resources

General Observations

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) has strong fiscal practices as evidenced by the reports from the District's external auditors, strong reserves, and documented practices in place to help achieve the District's goals of Organizational Effectiveness and Resources and Collaboration. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Treasurer serves as the executive head which oversees all financial operations, including directing the development of financial strategies, policies, programs, models, controls, and standards to ensure the financial integrity and performance of the colleges, and also supports the overall strategic missions of the District. The CFO also monitors the effectiveness of the Board-approved budget allocation mechanisms and plans, develops, directs, and evaluates the District's treasury that includes cash and investment management. The CFO manages and directs the following departments: 1) Budget and Management Analysis; 2) Accounting; 3) Central Financial Aid; and 4) Office of Internal Audit.

Under the direction of the CFO, there are 91 staff members who provide services to the colleges. Staffing includes six staff members within the CFO Office. In the Budget and Management Analysis department, eight staff provide direction to the colleges on budget development, budget monitoring, and analysis of budget activity; in Accounting, 57 staff are responsible for general accounting, accounts payable, and payroll; in Central Financial Aid, 13 staff ensure all student aid programs are in compliance; and seven staff in the Office of Internal Audit provide investigations and internal control improvements.

The District's main budget committee is the District Budget Committee (DBC), a District-level governance committee comprised of the nine college presidents, six Academic Senate representatives, six Faculty Guild representatives, and one representative from each of the following: AFT (American Federation of Teachers) Staff Guild, Local 911 Teamster, EEIU Local 99, Building and Construction Trades, Supervisors Local 721, Classified Management, and Associated Students Organization. This committee also includes the deputy chancellor, chief financial officer, and budget director as resource personnel. The DBC reports to both the chancellor and all constituent groups, and is charged with formulating recommendations to the chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District's Strategic Plan; reviewing the District's budget; making recommendations to the chancellor for adoption or modifications; and reviewing the District's financial condition on a quarterly basis.

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

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

East Los Angeles College (ELAC) has financial resources sufficient to maintain its fixed operational costs and contribute to the district reserves to provide long-term stability and growth. The college has a general unrestricted budget of \$106.5million, and has budgeted \$100 million to cover projected expenditures and provide for a 1% contingency for strategic initiatives or innovation. Additionally, the College's prudent approach to fiscal management has contributed to ensure the financial stability of the entire district by contributing \$25.2 million to the District's General Reserves. The College utilizes Program Review and Annual Update augmentation processes to distribute resources to support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. In addition, restricted funds supplement the instructional services, student support services and operations. Self-generated revenues provide additional resources for the College.

The College has clearly defined guidelines and processes for financial planning and development. The budget process is directly connected to the college's mission and goals as evidenced in Program Review and Annual Update Augmentation Plans. The College engages in financial planning at several levels and the process is integrated with institutional planning. The ELAC budget calendar is integrated with the district calendar established annually by the LACCD BOT. The college's internal budget development process is integrated with the college processes to determine staffing needs, operations needs and strategic resources needed to meet their goals. All resource requests are prioritized and vetted through a college participatory governance process. By establishing budget priorities for special initiatives and projects, funding is made available through contingency dollars or use of college reserves.

The District practices effective oversight and management of all financial resources. It also continuously evaluates and improves its oversight of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contracts, foundations, etc. Oversight and review of the status of all restricted and unrestricted funds also takes place at the campus through office of the vice president of Administrative Services. Monthly budget updates are distributed to the Budget Committee and ELAC Shared Governance Council on budget and FTES. The college ensures the timely dissemination of financial information throughout the institution. Immediate access to approved resources for departments/units is available through the District's integrated financial system called Systems, Applications, and Products (SAP).

The District annually has an independent audit performed to verify the accuracy of its financial statements and fiscal management practices as well as the effectiveness of its internal controls. Internal audits resulted in some areas of weaknesses in purchasing and asset allocation at the District, but corrective action plans and processes have been implemented to address deficiencies. In response to any college audit findings, the College prepares a corrective action plan. Financial audits, with continued unqualified opinions, support the

assertion that the institution manages its financial affairs with integrity and continues to remain financially stable.

The District's annual OMB A-133 audit is used to determine compliance with major Federal programs such as Title IV. The College Financial Aid Office monitors and manages student loan default rates on an annual basis. Through this review, the College identified that with increasing volume of loans and the shift from a two-year to three-year cohort rate, the default rate has increased from 14.3 % to 19.2%, which is still below the federal requirement.

Findings and Evidence

LACCD, In October 2013, the Board of Trustees adopted the District Financial Accountability Measures in response to a 2013 Accreditation Evaluation Report for Los Angeles Valley College, which recommended that accountability measures be put in place to ensure long-term fiscal stability and financial integrity of the college. The District Financial Accountability Measures are used to ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of all colleges within the District and require that each college president include provisions for (1) a balanced budget; (2) long-term enrollment plans; (3) position control for personnel; (4) an annual financial plan; (5) quarterly reporting on expenditures and overall fiscal status; (6) a college reserve policy; and (7) action plans. (III.D.1)

The College has sufficient revenues to support and sustain educational programs and services to improve effectiveness. ELAC's current annual budget of \$106.5 million supports fixed operating costs of 86%, funds budget augmentations from Program Review and Annual Update Plans (AUP) requests and provides a 1% contingency to be used as needed. This is evidenced in reviewing the copies of the college annual budget, program reviews and AUPs. Additionally, ELAC's revenue includes a carry-forward balance of \$9.8 million and has contributed \$25.2 million to the District's General Reserves for support of the entire district. (III.D.1)

The District's budget planning process is clearly laid out in the District's "Operation Plan Instructions" for 2015-16 (District's website) which covers the budget calendar for the year and detailed instructions on how the budget will be prepared. In reviewing the last three years' final budgets, the team finds that they are well done and contain a very good analysis of the budget in both summary and detailed form. Information is presented at both the District and college levels and includes the general fund as well as the other funds of the District (i.e., bookstore, cafeteria, child development, building, financial aid, special revenue, and debt service funds). The plan includes the chancellor's recommendations on the use of \$57.67 million of State Mandated Reimbursement Revenues and how they were tied to the District's Strategic Plan Goals. (III.D.3-4, 6)

While the District's Financial Accountability Measures require that the colleges maintain position control for personnel, upon discussion with finance staff, it was noted that the

District's information system does not currently have a tool to track and maintain personnel costs. While the District's percentage of salaries and benefits compared to overall expenditures is approximately 85 percent, several of the colleges significantly exceed this amount. (III.D.4)

The District has an internal audit department that regularly reviews all business and finance systems to ensure compliance with relevant policies, procedures, laws, and statutory regulations. The Internal Audit Plans for the last three years reflect a focus on cash controls, procurements/contracts, Associate Student organizations, foundations, human resources, special requests, financial aid, and the fraud hotline. Over the last three years the internal audit department averaged 7,500 audit hours per year. (III.D.5) (III.D.8)

ELAC's annual allocation of state apportionment revenues is distributed through an LACCD allocation model is primarily driven by FTES, but additionally provides a minimum base funding for the college to fund minimum administrative staffing, maintenance and operations costs, and district/campus safety. An assessment is charged to the college for District costs and District-wide costs, which is then reduced from their net allocation. A review of the District Annual Budget book confirms this process. The College has clearly defined guidelines and processes for financial planning and development that utilizes the college's mission and goals as its foundation. As demonstrated in Program Review Self Evaluations and Annual Update Plans (AUP) augmentation requests it is evident that resource requests support the mission and goals and reflect a realistic assessment of financial resource availability and financial stability.

The ELAC Budget Committee is the central body through which college budget decisions are vetted and recommendations to the ELAC Shared Governance Council are sought. The Budget Committee also recommends budget policies and adjustments to budget development process and develops policies that link resource allocation with the planning agenda presented in the Educational Master and Strategic Plans. The ELAC budget development process effectively links resource allocation and provides a general timeline toward achieving that goal. The Annual Update Plan is the central vehicle through which planning and budget are connected. Each year, every department/unit submits a plan detailing activities and future goals related to the Educational Master and Strategic Plans. All requests for staffing, equipment, and additional resources required for those activities are identified in their AUP. Faculty and staff position requests are evaluated and prioritized by the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) and the Human Resources Council, respectively, based on the College's institutional plans. The prioritized requests are then forwarded to the Academic Senate and Shared Governance Council for recommendation to the president for approval. AUPs for other requests are forwarded to administrators to prioritize in alignment with College Mission and institutional plans. Decisions are made on the basis of the College's base allocation and projected carry-forward balanced for the general fund, as evidenced in reviewing the College's balanced budget. (III.D.2, III.D.3, III.D.4, III.D.6)

The College provides oversight and review of the status of all restricted and unrestricted funds takes place at the campus through office of the vice president of Administrative Services. Monthly budget updates are distributed to the Budget Committee on which sound

financial decision-are made. The college ensures the timely dissemination of financial information throughout the institution. Checks and balances are built into the Systems Application and Products (SAP) system to ensure no single person can initiate a purchase, authorize expenditures, or spend the funds. Purchases cannot be encumbered unless the account has adequate funds in the SAP system. The College manages their finances in a responsible manner as evidenced in the absence of external audit findings particular to the College for the past several years. Documents, including budget and financial audits, indicate the college has financial resources sufficient resources to support student learning programs and services. (III.D.5, III.D.6)

The District has an internal audit department that regularly reviews all business and finance systems to ensure compliance with relevant policies, procedures, laws, and statutory regulations. The Internal Audit Plans for the last three years reflect a focus on cash controls, procurements/contracts, Associate Student organizations, foundations, human resources, special requests, financial aid, and the fraud hotline. Over the last three years the internal audit department averaged 7,500 audit hours per year. (III.D.5) (III.D.8)

The District has several reserves. Since 2013-14, the District has had a general fund reserve of six and one-half percent of expenditures and other uses, and a contingency reserve of three and one-half percent. Over the last three years, the District has maintained an ending balance over 13 percent. There is also a two percent set aside used to fund deferred maintenance projects, which is sometimes referred to as the Deferred Maintenance Reserve. (III.D.5) (III.D.9)

Audit reports are available for review on the District's website and the last three years' reports all included "unmodified" opinions rendered by the District's external auditors, the cleanest opinion an auditor can give. The Management, Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) for the last three years was well done and included a summary of the history of the District, a summary of economic factors, and explanations of changes between current-year and prior-year numbers. There were no "material weaknesses" reported in the audit reports for the years ending June 30, 2013, 2014, and 2015. There was a "significant deficiency" reported in each of the last three years' reports related to information technology controls, and "To Be Arranged" (TBA) hours that have been outstanding since the 2007 fiscal audit. In 2014, the audit report included several recurring significant deficiency findings in the EOPS/CARE programs, but those were cleared in 2015. In the last three years, there have been other findings that are considered significant deficiencies and/or compliance findings, but recent results show the District clearing those findings by the next audit year. (III.D.7) (III.D.10)

The District's audit reports for the bond program are posted on the District's website. There are two separate reports, one for performance audits and the second for financial audits. The performance audit reports (2006-07 through 2013-14) are quite detailed and address such things as analysis of change orders, completeness of operating procedures, and evaluation of the project close-out process. The financial reports (2007-08 through 2014-15) are broken down between Proposition A, Proposition AA and the Measure J bond programs, each with a separate opinion. For the 2014-15 financial report, all three opinions were all unmodified and the results of the auditor tests disclosed no instance of noncompliance or other matters that

are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. For the performance audits, it was noted that there were several substantial improvements over key capital project delivery processes compared to what was found in previous years. There were several areas where additional improvements could be made which included two medium-priority opportunities and three low-priority opportunities. No high-priority opportunities were identified. (III.D.8)

The College regularly evaluates and monitors internal cash control policies and procedures. The Administrative Services Office assists college personnel with accounting, purchasing, and overall budget needs as evidenced in Budget committee meeting minutes outlining various training opportunities. The District reviews cash flow on a regular schedule and has maintained a sufficient cash flow, and reserves ranging from 13% to 17%. Since 2013-14 the District has had a General Fund Reserve of 6.5% of expenditures and other uses, and a Contingency Reserve of 3.5%. Additionally, ELAC has contributed \$25.2 million to the District's General Reserves. (III.D.8, III.D.9)

The cash available to the District is sufficient as evidenced by the District not participating in Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) since the 2012-13 year, and the cash balance reported to the State Chancellor's Office in the CCFS-311Q. Over the last three years, the report showed a low of \$51,116,662 and a high of \$262,061,404 for cash balances. (III.D.9)

The District has adequate property and liability coverage in the amounts of \$600 million and \$40 million, respectively. The District's property deductible is \$25,000 per occurrence, and the liability self-insurance retention is \$1.5 million per occurrence. The District is self-insured for Workers' Compensation up to \$750,000 per claim through USI, with excess coverage through Safety National. Because some of the colleges have incurred huge debt to the District, the District Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee has recommended a debt repayment policy. The committee also proposed a plan for future STRS/PERS increases. In the 2015-16 budget, the District set aside \$20 million (later revised to \$22 million) of one-time funds to fund the future obligation for the STRS/PERS increases that will impact the District over the next few years. The District's plans call for using a portion of the \$22 million each year to cover two-thirds of the cost of the increase; this will cover the on-going increase through 2020-21. (III.D.10) (III.D.11)

The District practices effective oversight and management of all financial resources. It continually evaluates and, where needed, improves its oversight of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contracts, foundations, auxiliary organizations and institutional investment and assets. The District has both centralized and decentralized practices to ensure effective oversight. The District has a long history of compliance and sound financial management and oversight practices. Fiscal and Enrollment Management is evaluated quarterly to review FTES and college fiscal practices, providing a framework for sound college enrollment and financial practices, as evidenced in ELACs quarterly Recap Packets. (III.D.10)

The College's short range decisions are well integrated with long-term financial plans in areas of facilities maintenance and development, instructional technology, enrollment

management, and hiring decisions. Budget requests from department/units are aligned with the college Strategic Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Educational Master Plan, and Technology Plan. Funding for long-term financial plans are provided first by lottery, instructional equipment, or Perkins funds. If additional funding is needed, the college will use their carry-forward balances or reserve fund. (III.D.11)

The District has a significant, unfunded liability for retiree healthcare. As of the 2013 actuarial valuation, the liability was estimated at \$478,320,000 and the market value of assets in the District's Irrevocable Trust (PERS) was \$76,800,000, resulting in an unfunded balance of \$401,520,000. The District Annual Required Contribution (ARC) for 2014-15 was \$34,604,000, and the District made contributions of \$29,604,235. At the end of fiscal year 2014-15, the liability was 16.06 percent funded. While there was no official plan to fund the entire OPEB liability, steps have been taken to mitigate the liability. Examples of that include changing the health benefit plan to PERS Medical which reduced the liability by over \$120 million, the creation of the irrevocable trust through CalPERS, and the negotiated settlement with all six collective bargaining groups to take 1.92 percent of COLA in 2006 and apply it toward the ARC. Over the last two years, the District contributed 86 percent of the ARC payment. At the time of the accreditation visit, the District was waiting for the draft of the 2015 Actuarial Valuation. (III.D.12)

The District's long-term debt schedule reflects a liability of \$4.3 billion with most of the debt being General Obligation Bonds where debt payment resources will come from taxes on local property. Other long-term debt reported is Workers' Compensation claims, general liability claims, compensated absences, and capital lease obligations. One liability that is not recorded is for load banking, an option available to faculty as part of the faculty collective bargaining agreement, Article 39. Discussion with District managers confirmed that the colleges have load banking obligations, but a liability has not been booked into the District's financial statements. (III.D.12, 14) District audits reveal no locally incurred debt instruments. (III.D.13)

At the College, all financial resources including auxiliary activities, fund raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with goal setting and the intended purposes of the funding source. Oversight of ASO accounts is provided by the Vice Presidents of Student Services and Administrative Services. Grant and categorical program administration is overseen by the appropriate dean of Academic Affairs or Student Services and the College Business Office. The college follows district policy and procedures for establishing, managing, and monitoring funding sources from outside the district as evidenced in Internal Audit Reports prepared by the District's Internal Auditor in 2015. Action plans for recommendations are prepared with timelines for completion. (III.D.14)

The District does not have any Certificates of Participation outstanding. Auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grant monitoring are done at each of the colleges, with some oversight from the District. Claims are done through the District's Accounting Office. For example, the District's Internal Audit department has spent significant hours auditing the Colleges' Associated Student Organization funds and college foundations. The District also coordinates the external financial audits for the college foundations. The Los Angeles

Community College District Foundation has not had much activity over the last several years. The last audit report was for the years ended June 30, 2012 and 2013; at that time, cash assets were \$328,845. Reviewing the District’s Financial Summary, the cash balance as of February 29, 2016, is \$384,975. There is a Representation Letter with the auditors to do a review of the financial statements for the years ended June, 30, 2014 and 2015. A review is proposed instead of an audit due to the limited activity. (III.D.14)

The College identified that with increasing volume of loans and the shift from a two-year to three-year cohort rate, the default rate has increased from 14.3 % to 19.2%. Although this rate is still below the federal requirement, the College has implemented informational workshops for students such as “Financial Aid Pathway to Success” to help students understand goal setting, budgeting, and academic tracking as evidenced in the Financial Aid Events Calendar. (III.D.15)

The District’s Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) coordinates the work of college Financial Aid offices and ensures college and District operations are legally compliant. The unit implements standardized policies and procedures throughout the District, reconciles student loan programs, and provides guidance to college administrators and Financial Aid managers. The CFAU also assures that the colleges clean up any audit issues as soon as discovered and tracks and makes phone calls to help collect on the Federal Perkins Loan Program. Default rates for the last four years were provided by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

Perkins Default Rates

	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12
LA City	25.35%	22.67%	26.44%	28.00%
East LA	24.53%	18.33%	17.46%	14.52%
LA Harbor	33.33%	37.50%	33.33%	33.33%
LA Mission	10.00%	14.29%	28.57%	41.67%
LA Pierce	33.96%	33.33%	41.67%	35.90%
LA Southwest	31.58%	27.59%	34.00%	34.00%
LA Trade-Tech	36.66%	43.75%	38.54%	21.30%
LA Valley	12.68%	14.29%	12.63%	32.39%
West LA	46.88%	34.48%	39.13%	47.62%

Four colleges had a Perkins default rate that exceeded 30 percent for three, straight years. Los Angeles Harbor, Los Angeles Pierce, Los Angeles Trade-Technical (LATT), and West Los Angeles had total principal outstanding loans in default that exceeded 240 days in the amount of \$874,202. The District is phasing out the Perkins Loan Program and is moving to the Direct Loan Program. The published default rates for the Direct Loan Program only go through fiscal year 2012. Only one of the nine colleges had rates over 30 percent-LATT at 32.2 percent; however, it has been in the program for only one year. (ER5) (III.D.10) (III.D.15)

The College procurement staff reviews each contract to ensure it complies with statutory requirements and institutional policies and are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of its programs, services, and operations. Evidence on the Intranet provides resources of Procurement Training workshops, manuals, and handouts that have been developed to assist staff. Review of a sampling of contracts provides evidence that this review is consistent. (III.D.16)

Conclusion

The team commends the District for its substantial support of the internal audit function. With the exception of Standard III.D.7 and III.D.12, the District meets the Standards.

District Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness and better assess financial resource availability, the team recommends that the District implement a District position control system to track and budget for personnel costs. (III.D.4)

District Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District comprehensively responds to the recurring audit findings concerning: 1) the internal control weakness in information technology controls over the areas of security and change management; and 2) the state compliance exceptions related to “To Be Arranged” (TBA) hours attendance documentation and course classifications. (III.D.7)

District Recommendation 7 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District develop and publicize a plan to fully fund the Other Post Employment Benefit (OPEB) Liability, which is currently funded at 16.06 percent. (III.D.12)

District Recommendation 8 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District develop a process to capture the full impact of the District’s liability for load banking and to record the liability in the District’s financial statements. (III.D.12)

IV.A – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The College has a system of governance that includes the participation of faculty, classified staff, administration, and students. The College promotes an emphasis on innovation, including the development of innovation grants to support change aligned with the Strategic Master Plan. Decision-making processes are collaborative, documented, and evaluated; decisions are widely distributed.

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

Findings and Evidence

Through interviews with college personnel and review of the evidence, the team confirmed the College's commitment to participatory governance and a climate of innovation. Goal 4 of the College's Mission Statement directly addresses the commitment to institutional effectiveness, accountability, and improvement of college programs and governance. Innovation is initiated through a number of channels, including Program Reviews, the Grants Committee, and the recent task forces that have addressed First Year Experience (FYE), transfer, student equity, the South Gate Educational Center, and adult education. A subcommittee of the ESGC (East Los Angeles Shared Governance Committee) has developed a process for awarding innovation grants that align with the College's Strategic Master Plan goals. (IV.A.1)

Participatory governance at the College is designed to include students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators in the decision-making process. This complies with: state regulations mandating constituent group participation in institutional governance; collective bargaining agreements; Board Rule 18200; and the College Shared Governance Agreement. The College Governance Policy Handbook delineates committees and processes. The ESGC (East Los Angeles Shared Governance Council) is the primary participatory governance body and is the recommending body to the president on processes and policy matters. ESGC subcommittees include the Educational Planning Subcommittee, the Technology Planning Subcommittee, the Budget Committee, the Work Environment Committee, the Facilities Planning Subcommittee, and the Strategic Planning Committee. Interviews with classified staff indicated that, while opportunities for staff participation are available, fewer staff members participate than is desired, largely due to workload and time constraints. In addition to participatory governance committees, additional campus-wide opportunities for providing input include Town Hall meetings, Chairs' Meetings, the Learning Assessment Committee, the Student Success Committee, and the Student Success and Support Program

Committee. Interviews and evidence confirm that College personnel also are active in District governance. (IV.A.2)

The Academic Senate, which includes representatives from all academic departments, meets twice monthly to consider academic and professional issues and forwards recommendations to the College president or to the appropriate committees. These academic and professional areas include curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, educational program development, standards or policies regarding student preparation and success, college governance structures as they relate to faculty roles, faculty involvement in accreditation processes, professional development activities, program review processes, institutional planning and budget development, and other academic and professional matters that are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the Senate. The Senate takes a strong advocacy role for the improvement of teaching and learning via support for the professional activities of faculty. Staff members are encouraged to participate in their unit's Program Review and to serve on program review validation committees. They also provide input to participatory governance committees through their bargaining unit representatives. Board Rule 1800 requires that students be given the opportunity to participate in the development of policies and procedures that affect students. (IV.A.2)

Faculty and administrators have a substantial role in governance, planning, and budget. Administrators are assigned according to their areas of responsibility and expertise. The Academic Senate provides faculty with a list of committees, leadership roles, and meeting schedules. When faculty are needed to fill committee vacancies, the Academic Senate solicits new members. For those governance leadership positions that require substantial time commitments, reassignment or release time is provided. In each academic department, adjunct faculty have a representative who can vote on department decisions and processes. An adjunct faculty representative also serves on the Academic Senate. The team confirmed that newer faculty are encouraged to serve on participatory governance committees. (IV.A.3)

From a district perspective, faculty and administrators have ample opportunity for providing input on institutional policies, planning, and budget through participation on college-level governance committees, District wide executive administrative councils, and District-level governance committees. At all the colleges, administrators serve on governance committees based on their areas of expertise. The LACCD and AFT (American Federation of Teachers) Agreement 2014-2017 (Agreement) emphasizes the importance of faculty representation from the union and senate on participatory governance committees. The LACCD and AFT Agreement specifies which committees require faculty representation and those for which it is recommended. The Agreement requires faculty membership for both Budget and Strategic Planning Committees. (IV.A.3.)

The roles of faculty and administrators related to curriculum are defined in the Governance Policy Handbook and the SLO Philosophy Statement. The team reviewed the Governance Policy Handbook and Curriculum Committee minutes to establish that College faculty have primary responsibility for curriculum through the Curriculum Committee, which is composed of faculty representatives from department clusters. This responsibility includes reviewing all new curricula prior to approval by the Board of Trustees. The Curriculum Committee also

oversees revision of existing courses and programs. Interviews with administrators and a review of the Governance Policy Handbook demonstrate faculty play a substantial role on faculty hiring committees, in faculty evaluations, and in departmental program reviews, which directly affect student learning programs and services. Faculty and administrators further contribute to student learning through service on the Student Success Committee and the Student Success and Support Programs Committee. (IV.A.4)

Faculty and administrators follow well-defined structures in making recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services at the district level. All nine of the LACCD colleges reference in their self-evaluations the primacy of faculty in making recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. Administrative regulation E-65 lays out in great detail a step-by-step process for curriculum development and approval. This process recognizes the primacy of faculty members in making curriculum recommendations while also ensuring administrative input in the curriculum process. (IV.A.4.)

The District and College governance system, in design and practice, includes participation from multiple constituent groups. For example, Board Rule Article XVIII, Section 18102 recognizes the obligation to consult with the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters. Board Rule 18200 provides for student participation in the development of district and college policies and procedures. In the Governance Policy Handbook, the College calls for collegial dialog that empowers students to achieve their goals. The Governance Policy Handbook also clarifies the roles in governance of the Board, chancellor, president, faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students. (IV.A.5)

There are well-defined processes for communication before internal administrative and external Board decisions are made that impact faculty, staff, and students. Recommendations from governance and contractually mandated committees are solicited before decisions are made.

The roles of administrators and faculty in the development of District policy are delineated in Board Rule XVII, Article I-Academic Senate and Board of Trustees Shared Governance Policy and Article II-Students and Board of Trustees Shared Governance Policy and in Chancellor's Directive No. 70. LACCD does not have a classified senate. The AFT Staff Guild, Local 1521A, represents the full-time and part-time classified clerical/technical administrative staff. The Supervisory Employees' Union, S.E.I.U. Local 721, represents regular full-time and regular part-time classified employees of the District who are assigned to classifications in the Supervisory Unit.

"Role of the Unions," in the *District Governance and Functions Handbook*, describes District-level consultation between the administration and representatives of the six bargaining units. Consultation occurs through:

1. direct consultation during regular meetings between union representatives and the chancellor and/or the college presidents;

2. regular monthly grievance meetings between union representatives, the chancellor, the chancellor's designees and/or the college presidents;
3. participation in relevant District and college governance and decision-making committees, including the District Budget Committee, the Joint Labor/Management Benefits Committee, and the college governance councils; and
4. direct representation from the Resource Table during monthly Board meetings.

In some cases, it appears that classified staff do not have appropriate representation on District-level institutional governance committees regarding institutional planning, policies, and other key considerations. For example, the Student Success Initiative Committee (SSIC) states that the “overarching purpose of the Student Success Initiative is to create an effective District wide network of faculty, administrators and *staff* dedicated to improving student success.” However, the committee’s membership does not include representatives from the classified staff. Likewise, the committee membership of the District Planning Committee does not include representation from the classified staff. (IV.A.5)

Through interviews and a review of the Governance Policy Handbook, the team affirmed that decision-making processes and the resulting decisions are documented and widely disseminated via regularly scheduled committee meetings and minutes posted online. Faculty, students, and staff who attend shared governance and other decision-making committees are encouraged to report back to their constituents. The President’s office also publishes a weekly electronic bulletin. (IV.A.6)

Interviews confirmed that participatory governance bodies review their procedures and processes. The Governance Policy Handbook includes the timeframe for ongoing committee evaluations. The Governance Policy Handbook is itself routinely evaluated, and is in its fourth edition. (IV.A.7)

Conclusion

The College and District meet the Standard.

District Recommendation 9 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District review the membership of institutional governance committees to ensure all employee groups, particularly classified staff, have formal input on institutional plans, policies, and other key considerations as appropriate. (IV.A.5.)

IV.B – Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

The president is the chief executive officer at the College and reports to the chancellor of the District. College governance is exercised through participatory governance committees. The president manages the administration of the College and delegates authority as appropriate. The president uses a variety of means to communicate his priorities and monitors the College's performance indicators. The president has placed a high priority on the accreditation visit and has dedicated resources to support the continued accreditation of the College. The president conforms to statutes, regulations, and Board Rules. The president develops and maintains a program of community outreach and maintains partnerships with public and private entities.

Findings and Evidence

The president has held office since 2013. Review of the evidence presented and interviews with senior administrators and college personnel confirm that the president provides clear leadership for planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. A review of District hiring procedures confirms the president is involved in the final selection of all administrators, full-time faculty, and key staff. The dean of institutional advancement reports to the president, meets regularly with the cabinet, and provides data for planning and assessing institutional effectiveness. The president regularly uses data in his presentations to internal and external constituencies, and interviews with administrators and faculty leaders confirm that data is used to initiate change and to measure progress. (IV.B.1)

The president manages the administration of the college and serves on the chancellor's cabinet. He meets regularly with college managers. He gives an annual "State of the College" address. Interviews with college administrators confirm the president is accessible and collaborative, and he delegates authority as appropriate. A shared governance council makes recommendations to the president on matters of procedure and practice. Additional managers have been hired as the college has grown in size and complexity. The executive director of the Foundation is a direct report of the president and they have a standing weekly meeting. The president is a voting member of the Foundation board of directors and gives a report at each meeting. (IV.B.2)

The president uses a variety of means to communicate his priorities, including opening day remarks, regular reports, an annual "State of the College" address, and regular meetings with managers. Following the practice of the prior, interim president, the president has used task forces to address specific issues, such as First Year Experience, Transfer, the South Gate Educational Center, Student Equity, and Adult Education. The president meets regularly with the dean of institutional advancement. The president follows performance indicators, including state Scorecard data, Institutional Effectiveness Framework, and strategic planning

goals. The president participates in budget discussions at the college and district to ensure alignment between planning, learning, and budgeting. (IV.B.3)

The president has prioritized accreditation in his Opening Day remarks for several years. He reports on accreditation to the shared governance council. The president convened an accreditation workgroup and encouraged faculty participation in SLOs. The president has served on two recent visit teams for the Commission, as have the accreditation liaison officer (ALO) and accreditation faculty chair. Release time is provided to the accreditation faculty chair. (IV.B.4)

Interviews with college personnel confirm the president leads the College compliance with statutes, regulations, and Board Rules; works with District legal counsel when appropriate; and controls the budget and expenditures to conform to the mission of the college. (IV.B.5)

The team reviewed evidence that presented communication as a high priority for the president. The president develops and maintains a program of community outreach and relations. The college uses a variety of media, including the college website, social media, print media, and paid advertising, to communicate with the surrounding communities. The president oversees external communication staff and processes. Interviews and evidence demonstrate the president builds and maintains partnerships with businesses, schools, non-profit agencies, and governments, which have led to specific partnerships such as Go East LA, Univision, and the City of Monterey Park. The college has hosted several key community and regional meetings and forums in recent years. (IV.B.6)

Conclusions

The College and District meet the Standard.

Standard IV.C- Governing Board

General Observations

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

Findings and Evidence

The roles and responsibilities of the Board and LACCD administrative leadership are codified in the Board Rules. The District administration implements those rules through creation of Chancellor's Directives and Administrative Regulations. In addition, the Board has four standing committees: Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success; Budget and Finance; Legislative and Public Affairs; and Facilities Master Planning and Oversight. Membership is limited to Board members only, has a specific charge, and is designed to ensure the Board exercises authority and responsibility to assure the colleges and District run effectively. Chaired by the vice president of the Board and made up of all Board members, the Committee of the Whole reviews District wide standards and performance for efficiency and quality. The governing authority rests with the entire Board, not with individual members. (IV.C.1-2)

The Board Rule (BR) found in Chapter X: Human Resources, Article III, Selection Policies #10308 clearly delineates the process for the hiring of the college CEOs; no such Board Rule exists for the hiring of the chancellor. However, the Board used a clearly defined process in the hiring of the most recent chancellor which has yet to be codified. HR E-210: Performance Evaluation, College President/Senior Academic Executive clearly delineates the process for the evaluation of college presidents. Chancellor's Directive (CD) 122 provides for an evaluation process for the chancellor and the college presidents and is outlined in the executive contracts. The process provided for in CD 122, however, is not evidence of a Board policy. (IV.C.3)

The Board holds regularly scheduled meetings that allow for public comment on general and specific agenda items. The Board holds meetings at the colleges as well as at the Education Service Center (ESC), where the chancellor and District's administrative offices are housed. At the Board meetings, there are opportunities for public comment in general or on specific agenda items. The Board uses the Legislative and Public Affairs Committee to engage discussion about issues related to the public interest. (IV.C.4)

Board policies are codified in Board Rules and are available on the District website. The Board Rules establish the Board's role in establishing policy with the acknowledgement that it has the ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Board also has standing committees designed to ensure they are abreast of matters pertaining to its responsibility for financial integrity and stewardship of the District. (IV.C.5)

The Board consists of seven members elected at-large for terms of four years. Elections are held every two years, alternating with three members being chosen in one election and four members at the other. The president and vice president of the Board of Trustees are elected by the Board for a one-year term at the annual organizational and regular meeting in July, and a nonvoting student trustee is elected annually by students for a one-year term beginning June 1. The student trustee has an advisory vote on actions other than personnel-related and collective bargaining items. (IV.C.6)

Board Rule 2301 gives the Board general authority to establish rules and regulations that are consistent with law. This Board Rule also authorizes the Board to delegate rulemaking authority to LACCD officers (such as the chancellor), employees, or committees. Under Board Rule 2902, the Board expressly authorizes the chancellor to adopt and implement Administrative Regulations. BR 2418.12, adopted by the Board in February 2007, directs the chancellor to perform periodic reviews of the Board Rules, Administrative Regulations, and procedural guides. Administrative Regulation C-12, also adopted in February 2007, establishes that reviews and revisions will be conducted by staff on a triennial basis and the process to be used. While there was evidence that revisions to Board Rules were forwarded to the Board for approval, there was no evidence that the triennial reviews were communicated to the Board when no revisions were made. No evidence was found that there is any assessment or review by the Board of the policies for their effectiveness in fulfilling the District mission. (IV.C.7)

As evidenced in its Board Rules, Chapter I, Article II, entitled the "Mission of the Los Angeles Community College District," the Board exercises oversight of the District's educational programs and has established an Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee to monitor the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. Through the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS), the Board of Trustees is kept regularly informed on key indicators of student learning and achievement. Additionally, Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review of the colleges' academic quality and institutional plans. Cyclic approval of Educational and Strategic Master Plans; review of District wide completion data covering a six-year period with a focus on improving student success data and academic quality; and an annual review and analysis of the state's Student Success Scorecard, which reports major indicators of student achievement, is documented. (IV.C.8)

Board Rule 2105 requires a formal orientation for new trustees. The last orientation occurred in June 2015 and included an overview of the functions and responsibilities of District Office divisions, conflict of interest policy, and the Brown Act. (IV.C.9)

The annual process for regular self-evaluations of the Board is delineated in BR 2301.10. The Board of Trustees has conducted its annual self-evaluation during a public session in which they reviewed data results from the preceding year and established new annual goals. (IV.C.10)

The Board is in compliance with establishing a policy on Board member code of ethics and conflict of interest with Board Rule 14000, Chapter XIV, and the implementation of these

standards is captured in the 2013 Actionable Improvement Plan (March 19, 2013). This plan outlines specific actions that Board members should take to reinforce these standards and to demonstrate its support as a collective entity by adoption of its Code of Ethical Conduct. (IV.C.11)

The Board sets policy with the delegation of responsibility to the chancellor and presidents for the execution of policies and procedures as well as day-to-day operational control of the District. Additionally, Board policy outlines the role of a trustee and identifies that “Authority is given to the Chancellor as the Trustees’ sole employee” with a pledge to “work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record.” The chancellor’s job description as well as BR 2902 authorizes the chancellor to adopt and implement administrative regulations and delegation of authority to the chancellor and presidents to administer the institutions. The functional map outlines the lines of authority and responsibilities. (IV.C.12)

The Board is extremely knowledgeable and fully engaged in all aspects of accreditation. The Board has been deliberate in its acquisition and application of knowledge on accreditation. Board members are aware of the importance of their role in the accreditation process. All Board members participate in ACCJC’s online training program on the topic. Meeting minutes document the formation of a Board ad hoc committee on accreditation in 2013 with the stated purpose of supporting all colleges participating in any aspect of the accreditation process. The Board has dedicated funds to support efforts and review any reports prior to submission to the Commission by any of the nine colleges. (IV.C.13)

Conclusions

The District meets Standard IV.C., except IV.C.3 and IV.C.7.

District Recommendation 10 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board adopt policies that clearly define the process for the selection and evaluation of the chancellor. (IV.C.3)

District Recommendation 11 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the Board establish a formal process for approving the review of policies in which no revisions are made and to regularly assess the effectiveness of all policies in fulfilling the District mission. (IV.C.7)

Standard IV. D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) is a complex, multi-college system comprised of a District Office, which houses the chancellor, senior administrators and District classified professional staff, as well as nine comprehensive community colleges that provide services in 40 cities and communities and cover an area of more than 882 square miles in the greater Los Angeles basin.

In total, the District has 46 District wide councils, committees, and consultative bodies in which District and college administrative staff, faculty, classified staff, and students regularly participate. All governance councils and committees maintain agendas and meeting summaries/minutes on the District website.

In previous years, operations of the District Office, now referred to as the Educational Services Center (ESC), were highly centralized, and many college decisions related to finance and budget, capital projects, hiring, payroll and contracts were made by District personnel. Operations subsequently have been increasingly decentralized. Colleges have been given considerable autonomy and authority for local decision-making to streamline administrative processes, encourage innovation, and hold college decision-makers more accountable to the local communities they serve. Diligent work by the institution has clarified functions and delineated areas of responsibilities between colleges and the ESC. Original recommendations regarding role delineation and decision-making processes in 2009 were resolved, and, by 2012, the District was commended for its work in this area. The ESC continues to evaluate these delineations on an ongoing basis.

In 2011, the District began a review of the budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayments. In 2012, the District developed and approved a new, well-defined allocation model that appears to be understood widely across the institution.

In the 2012 accreditation visit to the colleges, the District received a recommendation to adopt and fully implement an allocation model for its constituent colleges that addresses the size, economies of scale, and the stated mission of the individual colleges. By 2013, the recommendation was resolved, and the District received a commendation for its effort as well as for its transparent and collaborative process.

Findings and Evidence

The chancellor demonstrates his leadership and communication by various means. Evidence has shown that the chancellor communicates with all employees of the District about educational excellence and integrity through two publications posted on the District website: *Synergy* and *Accreditation 2016*. He leads a variety of meetings in which he communicates his expectations for excellence as well as reviews and discusses roles, authority and responsibility between colleges. These meetings include Chancellor's Cabinet, Presidents'

Council, and meetings with faculty and classified leadership. In addition, he leads and meets with a variety of District committees in which he articulates and provides leadership for the effective operation of the District as a whole and the individual colleges. The Board of Trustees has approved a District/college functional area map, developed in consultation with all major stakeholders across the District. The functional map clarifies the structure of District administrative offices and their relationship to the colleges, aligns District administrative functions with Accreditation Standards, and specifies outcome measures appropriate to each function identified. (IV.D.1)

The chancellor directs the ESC staff to ensure the delivery of effective and adequate District services to support the mission of each college. In addition to outlining the operational responsibilities and functions of the District Office, the 2013 *District Governance and Functions Handbook* details the District wide governance processes. The chancellor ensures effective and adequate District services in support of the colleges by requiring the ESC divisions to conduct an annual program review. As documented in the ESC Unit Program Review Guide, the ESC divisions monitor Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) with clear links to District-level goals and consider their main contributions to the mission of the colleges, goals, effectiveness, and/or student achievement or learning. In addition, an Educational Services Center User Survey was created to solicit college user feedback in support of the program review process. Common questions were developed for all units, with individual units having the ability to customize supplemental questions specific to their college users. Over 21 user groups, including District managers, deans, directors, vice presidents, and presidents participate in the survey. A review of the ESC program reviews reveal that all ESC divisions have completed at least one cycle of program review. Data from the ESC User Survey was disaggregated and used to identify strengths and weaknesses, receive feedback on the effectiveness of their services, and gather suggestions for improvement. Divisions with identified areas for improvement create plans to improve their services and strengthen their support of the colleges in achieving their missions. The Board received a presentation on the status of the ESC Program Review process in spring 2015. As documented by the *District Governance and Functions Handbook*, the District Budget Committee (DBC) provides leadership on District-level budget policies. Membership includes all nine college presidents, District Academic Senate (DAS) representatives, and collective bargaining unit representatives. Its charge is to: (1) formulate recommendations to the chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District Strategic Plan; (2) review the District budget and make recommendations to the chancellor, and (3) review quarterly District financial conditions. (IV.D.2)

In 2011, the District undertook a full review of its budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayment. DBC Minutes show that a review of other multi-college District budget models and policies was also conducted. This review led the District to adopt a model that established minimum-based funding. The Board of Trustees approved Phase I of the new allocation model in June 2012. This phase focused on the annual allocation of resources. During spring 2013, the District worked on Phase II, which covered the review of college carryover funds, reserve balances, college growth formula and college debts, and operating deficits. DBC minutes from September 18, 2013, show that these

changes were all reviewed and discussed at the DBC and approved by the Board of Trustees at their October 9, 2013.

The allocation model begins with an annual base allocation to fully fund minimum administrative staffing for each college. In particular, the base allocation includes funding for the following positions: the president, vice presidents, an institutional research dean, a facilities manager, and a number of deans (based on size of the college). In addition, the base allocation includes Maintenance and Operations costs based on an average cost per-gross-square-footage (currently \$8.49/square foot). After allocating the minimum base allocation, all remaining revenue (with a few exceptions, such as international student revenues) is distributed based on the each college's proportion of the funded FTES for the District. In the event that a college suffered a reduction in funding due to the new model, provisions for transition funding are included in the model. The model also provides charges for Central Accounts, Educational Services Center functions, and appropriate reserve levels at both the District and the colleges. The colleges can retain up to five percent of their year-end balances of the prior year Unrestricted General Fund budget, excluding the prior years' carryover funds. The model also includes provisions regarding how colleges with prior-year over-expenditures can pay off the debt. The model was included in the 2014-15 Final Budget of the District as Appendix F, and implementation of the model can be tracked in the 2015-16 Final Budget. As of the end of the 2014-15 year, there were five colleges with a total debt of \$19.2 million owed back to the District for prior-year over-expenditures. The colleges continue to express concerns regarding the handling of outstanding debt. (IV.D.2-3)

The District provides comprehensive budget and financial oversight, including an annual finance and budget report (CCFS-311), a final budget, an annual financial audit, a bond financial audit report, a performance audit of bond construction programs, year-end balance and open-order reports, full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) reports and targets, enrollment projections, and year-to-year comparisons with enrollment targets. The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditures. The District website has detailed monthly expenditure reports for the District and the colleges to assist with tracking, monitoring, and maintaining budgets, financial commitments, and expenditures. The colleges and District financial reports are reviewed by staff and are submitted to the Board of Trustees. Evidence in the self-evaluation illustrates that college presidents have full responsibility and authority to conduct their work without interference from the chancellor. College presidents have full authority in the selection and evaluation of their staff and management team. (IV.D.3)

The framework for CEO accountability is established through annual goal-setting between the chancellor and each college president. College presidents then complete a yearly self-evaluation based on their established goals. At least every three years (or sooner if requested), presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation, which includes an evaluation committee, peer input, and, if necessary, reassignment or dismissal. Evaluations are reviewed with the Board of Trustees in closed session. College presidents are also given full authority over their budgets and in allocating resources at their campuses. In October 2013, the Board adopted fiscal accountability measures which explicitly hold college presidents responsible to

the chancellor for their budgets, ensuring that they maintain “a balanced budget, as well as the efficient and effective utilization of financial resources.” (IV.D.4)

The LACCD Strategic Plan Vision 2017 (DSP) was created collaboratively among key constituent groups, with interviews confirming that faculty members, classified staff members, and administrators had ample opportunity for input. While written after the college strategic plans, the DSP generally integrates all of the college strategic plans by establishing a common framework through four overarching goals. The most consistent alignment, however, occurs through the annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports that are reported to the Board of Trustees. Using a standard report template and common metrics and data sources developed collegially by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), the colleges map college goals to the District goals, compare their progress against the District as a whole in their reviews, and provide an analysis of strengths and weaknesses in accomplishing planned objectives. These assessments, in turn, inform the Board of Trustees’ annual goals as well as future college and District planning priorities. Interviews and a review of District Budget Committee (DBC) minutes show the existence of integrated financial planning within the District. Incorporating college and District-level enrollment projections, the colleges and District jointly establish District wide FTES targets for the upcoming academic year in the spring semester. These targets are reviewed by the chancellor, the District Budget Committee, and the Board Budget and Finance Committee prior to final adoption of the budget in August of each year. (IV.D.5)

The District Budget Allocation Model utilizes these FTES projections and additional revenue streams to allocate funds to the colleges as well as to the Educational Services Center (ESC). In March, the colleges and the ESC develop budgets that reflect their planning and institutional priorities. Prior to adoption, college and ESC budgets are reviewed by the Board Budget and Finance Committee to ensure that priorities align with the DSP, Board goals, and the chancellor’s recommendations. The colleges and the District monitor revenue and expenditure projections throughout the year and have the ability to update financial plans and FTES growth targets. The District chief financial officer, college representatives, and ESC staff members meet on a quarterly basis to review revenue and cost projections and discuss adjustments or actions needed to maintain their alignment. (IV.D.5)

The Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC) coordinates the activities of several District-level, technology-related advisory groups and provides a forum for consultation on all technology-related issues. The TPPC developed the District Technology Plan, which created a framework of goals and a set of actions to guide District wide as well as technology planning. The District Technology Implementation Plan established measures and prioritized deployment of technology solutions in consideration of available resources. In addition, the TPPC serves as a clearinghouse for all policy issues related to District wide technology systems (e.g., updates on the SIS development). (IV.D.5)

District/college integrated planning also occurs during operational planning for District wide initiatives. Examples include joint marketing and recruitment activities, implementation of the Student Success and Support Program, Student Equity Plans, and the new student information system. These initiatives involve extensive District/college collaboration,

coordination with centralized District service units, and interaction with various District-level committees. Interviews during the visit confirmed intra-District discussions that impacted integrated planning had occurred during the Council of Academic Affairs, Council of Student Services, the District Academic Senate, Student Information System Development Team, and the District Research Committee. (IV.D.5)

Various mechanisms are used to evaluate the effectiveness of District/college integrated planning. The Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey is used to assess budget development and resource allocation, enrollment management, FTES, and facilities planning as well as the governance process as a whole. With the assistance of the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division, DPAC has analyzed three years of the survey (2010, 2012, and 2014) to look at trends and develop improvement plans based on the data. District-level planning and policy committees assess their effectiveness through annual committee self-evaluation reviews. In its 2015-16 work plan, DPAC is charged with systematically reviewing these self-evaluations and the Council will be making recommendations for improvement to the committees. Lastly, the ESC Program Review process assesses performance and outcomes through an annual User Survey and information specific to each service unit. A review of DPAC minutes as well as interviews with DPAC co-chairs and the vice chancellor of educational programs and institutional effectiveness provide evidence that the District regularly reviews its processes and provides opportunities for dialogue among key stakeholders. (IV.D.2, IV.D.5, IV.D.7)

A considerable amount of communication occurs between the nine colleges and the District. In total, the District has 46 District wide councils, committees, and consultative bodies in which District and college administrative staff, faculty, classified staff, and students regularly participate. All councils and committees maintain agendas and meeting summaries/minutes on either the District website (public) or on the District intranet. Seven District wide executive administrative councils meet monthly: (1) Chancellor's Cabinet; (2) Council of Academic Affairs; (3) Council of Student Services; (4) District Administrative Council; (5) Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC); (6) Human Resources Council; and (7) the Sheriff's Oversight Committee. (IV.D.6)

Four District-level governance committees meet monthly: (1) District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC); (2) District Budget Committee (DBC); (3) Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC); and (4) the Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC). Committee members encompass a broad range of college faculty, college researchers, and college deans, with representatives from the unions, college presidents, college vice presidents, and ESC senior administrators. The District Academic Senate (DAS) represents the faculty of the District in all academic and professional matters. In this capacity, the president and Executive Committee regularly inform faculty of District policy discussions and decisions related to educational quality, student achievement, and the effective operation of the District and colleges. (IV.D.6)

In 2011, District Information Technology (IT) undertook a complete redesign of the District website. The updated website, which allows each division/unit in the ESC to manage its own content, launched in fall 2012. The District planned to implement a new intranet site in

December 2015 to improve employee access to Educational Services Center divisions, units, and services; however, as of the evaluation visit, the intranet was still in the latter stages of implementation. Information Technology maintains 78 active listservs. These listservs include the District wide consultative bodies, administrative councils, and operational committees as well as subject-specific groups such as articulation officers, curriculum chairs, counselors, and IT managers. Each listserv has a coordinator/owner charged with maintaining an accurate list of members. Interviews during the visit revealed that while subscriptions to the listservs are typically comprised of members to the committees and councils, the subscriptions are open to any interested employee of the District. (IV.D.6)

Results from the Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey and discussions with representatives from key stakeholder groups, however, indicate concerns over effective communication about District decision-making bodies. In all three years of the survey, over half of respondents (58 percent in the most recent survey) said decisions made through participatory governance at the District level are not communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders. Moreover, among the most frequently mentioned concerns about District participatory governance across the three survey administrations has been a “lack of communication or transparency” and “insufficient representation or unbalanced participation from stakeholders.” Responding to the results in the survey, the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division and DPAC members co-presented a workshop at the annual DAS Summit in September 2015. The workshop addressed District wide communication and discussed data from recent governance surveys related to communications. A facilitated discussion followed, with participants brainstorming communication strategies which will be reviewed by DPAC in upcoming meetings. On the other hand, there was no evidence of workshops with members of the classified staff or other stakeholder groups. (IV.D.6)

In 2009, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC-formerly called the District Planning Committee or DPC) developed a District Governance and Decision-Making Survey and administered it in 2010. The DPAC implemented a cyclical process for system-level evaluation and improvement. The evaluation cycle has been institutionalized and District processes have been revised in support of institutional effectiveness as indicated in the development of new intranet sites for committee communication (IV.D.7)

With assistance from the EPIE division, DPAC established an annual self-evaluation process for all District governance committees. These common self-assessments document the accomplishments, challenges, and areas for improvement for the committees during the prior year. Results of the assessment are reviewed by each respective committee and serve as the basis for changes and improvements to committee function. Minutes confirm that DPAC reaffirmed their responsibility to ensure self-evaluations are conducted by District governance committees, results are posted online, and that they are used to improve committee effectiveness. (IV.D.7)

Role delineations are evaluated during the regular review of functional area maps. Revisions are made based on input from governance committee members, governance surveys, ESC administrative units, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and college stakeholders. Functional area

maps were expanded and revised in 2015 and are currently under review prior to finalization. (IV.D.1, IV.D.2, IV.D.7)

The *District Governance and Functions Handbook* is regularly reviewed and updated by District stakeholders under the coordination of the DPAC. A section of the handbook describes all District wide councils, committees, and consultative bodies. These entities were first formalized in 1994 by Chancellor's Directive (CD) 70: District wide Internal Management Consultation Process. Updates to CD 70, and its related committee/council structure, committee/council charge, membership, meeting schedule, leadership and reporting structure are currently in process as shown in DPAC minutes of November 20, 2015. (IV.D.7)

Conclusion

The District meets the requirements outlined in the Standards for multi-college districts.

The chancellor clearly and appropriately delegates authority and responsibility to the college presidents and communicates expectations for educational excellence and integrity to the District community. The District has made consistent progress in detailing areas of responsibilities, creating administrative and governance decision-making processes, and evaluating these functions and processes regularly for continuous quality improvement. Clear evaluation processes for the services provided by the ESC have been established and institutionalized. In recent years, the District, in collaboration with the colleges, has created a completely new resource allocation model in order to adjust the differential impact of fixed operating costs on the colleges based on size. In addition to the Budget Allocation policy, the District also adopted new District financial accountability policies to help control expenditures and maintain fiscal stability. Both policies include provisions that identify processes for regularly evaluating the budget allocation model.

While college planning drives the overall planning in the District in a decentralized model, the District has provided frameworks and decision-making processes that maintain alignment across the District. In particular, the annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports given to the Board of Trustees' Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee provide excellent examples of integrated planning in the District. The District has been especially diligent in providing formalized mechanisms for evaluating its decision-making processes and services using data and collegial feedback for continuous quality improvement. In the future, evaluations of the decision-making process should include analyses on the effects of decentralization on institutional excellence.

Given the complexity and size of the institution, as well as the decentralized nature of the decision-making process, the efforts of the District and colleges to collaborate and work collegially to support student learning and achievement are noticeable and commendable; however, unique challenges for effective and widespread communication about District wide decisions remain. The District should continue to address these communication gaps, particularly among classified professionals.

The team commends the District for its commitment to continuous quality improvement by building evaluation loops for all its services, decision-making processes, and institutional performance.

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

The Quality Focus Essay-

Team Review and Comment

ELAC identified in its Quality Focus Essay three primary efforts focused on increasing student success and academic excellence. The College provided evidence of thoughtful, college-wide, inquiry driven processes that were used to create the essay. The three areas are:

1. Strengthening the Transfer Culture
2. Streamlining the Basic Skills Math Pathway
3. Creating a Welcome Campaign

The College also included a section in their Institutional Self-Evaluations Report titled Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process. This is likely due to being one of the first colleges to be evaluated under the new standards, and following what was previously used in terms of self-identified action plans. This list of focused items are:

1. Building a sustainable SLO process
2. Creating a robust professional development program
3. Expanding communication efforts.

Taken together, these are excellent areas of focus for the college in its next cycle of evaluation. Comprehensive, measurable and aligned goals are set for each of the total of 6 areas, and will guide the institution well towards its midterm report in 4 years.